THEOLOGY

A Montbly Zournal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, ROWLANDS CASTLE, HANTS, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXI

NOVEMBER, 1930

No. 125

EDITORIAL

IN MEMORIAM C. H. TURNER

Our readers will have read with a very deep regret of the death of Professor Cuthbert Turner, one of the most valued and distinguished contributors to this Journal. Dr. Turner's scholarship was of that fine, constructive kind, which combined the minutest accuracy of detail with clear convictions as to the principles and aims of Christian learning. For him the Faith was the Truth, given through divine revelation; and the scholar's task was to set forth that Truth with ever-growing accuracy and sureness. If there were faulty bricks in the edifice, that was no reason for pulling it down, still less for building another: rather it was a challenge to the humbler, more exacting task of repairing it, where repair was necessary, brick by brick. That was why there was always something so strong and massive about his writings. He assumed that tradition was right, unless and until it were shown to be wrong; and in many cases where it was attacked he had little difficulty in showing it to be right. His principal contributions to THEOLOGY have been the following:

- 1. On Development and its Limitations . . ., IV. 137 ff. (March, 1922).
- 2. Our Appeal to History . . ., IX. 306 (December, 1924).
- 3. The Four Gospels: Their Text and Origin . . ., X. 217 (April, 1925). [A review of Canon Streeter's book.]
- 4. St. Peter in the New Testament . . ., XIII. 66 (August, 1926).
- 5. St. Peter and St. Paul in the New Testament and in the Early Church . . ., XIII. 190 (October, 1926).
- 6. The Conversations at Malines, 1921-1925 . . ., XVI. 192 (April, 1928).
- 7. Lausanne and Bangalore: The Problem of the South India United Church . . ., XVIII. 242 (May, 1929).
- 8. Jewish Christianity: The Apostolic Decree of Acts xv. and the Apostolic Church Orders . . ., XX. 4 (January, 1930).

XXI. 125

245

We mention these articles because some of our readers may wish to turn back to them, and also to ensure that they are not forgotten. And we may add that few, if any, of them were produced except at great cost. Partly this was due to his scrupulous love of accuracy, which made him a slow worker and unwilling to publish unless he had verified all his statements: and partly it was due to constantly recurring attacks of illness which left him feeling exhausted and weak. Others will assess the value and permanence of his contributions to theology, history, and patristic studies. To the Church at large he will be chiefly remembered for his studies on the Church and the Ministry, and his work on St. Mark in the New Commentary; but his more technical researches in the textual criticism both of the New Testament and of many documents of the early centuries, though necessarily less well known, will probably prove to be of no less value. For ourselves, we take leave of a correspondent whom we had come to love as a teacher and a friend. May he rest in peace.

News reaches us, as these pages go to press, of yet another dear friend and constant contributor to Theology, the Dean of Winchester. We shall hope to pay a brief tribute to him next month.

TOTAL TARRESPORT REFORMED BOTHER TO ALL THE TOTAL TO AREA THAT

nothinger such Engineers with a specialist and dusting overnors for

in this placery as at amount own or form has evolute attach and

hi vilipaire estil had set beapeata sen it moder meses times

rapide of the content of the party of the content o

TELL AND AND CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF THE

Transfer to the severe and the second and the second and the second test and the secon

of Labor statement come to weiver Lj. Rever Lingh,

ACCOUNT (TRANSPORTED NO. 1911 AND COCCOMOS) TO STATE

intermedial III alla de la deservación a constant de la constant d

of the Boar to and Att Predict the New Yorkshop to the think

d I've Consequence of Makeson 1991-1925 . . . KYI

Contest Charce . . . KVIII. 242 (May, 1929).
S. Jessich Christenstu, The Apostote Desue of Acts sv. and

(Other Appropriate Chartest Orders ... XX. 4 (January, 1930).

Laustinne und Baugalain: The Problem of the Scient Ladia

The Four Cosman, Tuesd

(8201 June) 901

SEL LES

(\$201 Such Sed) 100 William 1923).

add much tolk towns of againment to employ the appropriate

THE CATHOLIC IDEA OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES (II)*

and the form of the second and the second second

HIPPOLYTUS

D. In 1910 Schwartz (Eduard, Über die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen, 1910), and six years later Dom Connolly, vindicated and justified the thesis that in the "so-called Egyptian Church Order" we possess the lost Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus († 235). The best, if defective, text is the Latin Verona Fragments, published by Hauler in 1900 (Didascaliæ apostolorum fragmenta veronensia latina, Leipzig), and other versions exist in Arabic, Coptic, and Ethiopic. The chief means of access to these is in G. Horner, The Statutes of the Apostles, London, 1904. The Greek, save for a few bits, has disappeared. The complex problems as to the text, and its extraordinary history in the Canons of St. Hippolytus (cf. ed. by Haneberg, Munich, 1870), The Testament of our Lord (Cooper and Maclean, Edinburgh, 1902; Syriac, by Rahmani, 1899), and the Apostolic Constitutions (ed. by Funk, Rottenburg a.N., 1891; Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, Paderborn, 1905), must be passed over. The most convenient edition of a composite and connected text is in Appendix B to Connolly's So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents (Cambridge, 1916, pp. 175-194), used in what follows herewith.

This Apostolic Tradition is probably a unique document in the early history of the Christian Church. It is not a theological treatise, but a practical manual giving us precious knowledge of the circumstances, ideals, social life, economic situation, religious usages, and outlook of Hippolytus' Roman Community of the early third century. His whole protest against Callistus' innovations ensures that his congregational manual (as it is at least!) represents the "good old ways" as over against novelties in doctrine, discipline, or worship on the part of his opponents. It possessed an a priori authority for this reason, as the redaction, in broad principles and often in specific content, of ancient usage anterior to the days of the editor himself. That it was invested with, or was deemed already to possess, this authority is significantly shown by the amazing filiation, for example, of the Eucharistic rite. Before commenting upon the rite itself and its unique relationships to practically all subsequently prevailing rites, it may

^{*} A paper prepared for the Theological Committee to the Commission of the Episcopal Church of America on Faith and Order.

be well to mention some of the characteristic features of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition as a whole. It begins and concludes with a brief declaration of aim: the setting down of the true tradition in order to deliver his readers from heresy, since certain people have already gone astray and corrupted the teaching of the Apostles. The series of items begins with the consecration of a bishop, then the ordination of a presbyter and of a deacon. Then follow ordination of confessors, of widows, and a section on "Readers, Virgins, and Subdeacons." The long section on admission to the catechumenate (pp. 180-2)* introduces the rite of Baptism (pp. 183-5), which contains as well Confirmation and the First Communion (to p. 186). The Love-feast (Latin type—Statute 37, and Ethiopic, pp. 188-9) is described; a brief section on widows brings a collection of miscellaneous items-blessing of first-fruits, fasting, fasting-Communion, prayer, reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, daily clerical conference and duties, burial customs—and the daily devotional rule concludes the summary. One further preliminary comment as to the texture of the Eucharistic rite in A.T.: while the style is definitely Hippolytan (see on this, eight characteristic Hippolytanisms in Connolly, op. cit., pp. 164-6), the substance of the text is undoubtedly earlier than St. Hippolytus himself, probably Roman of the middle or later second century.

An approach to his Eucharistic Canon can best be had by reference to certain other contextual points of the A.T.: (1) The blessing of the first-fruits; these are to be "offered" to the "bishop, who will offer, bless, and name him who offered them" (the passage is represented, it happens, in a Greek text which has survived—cf. Mercati in the Gasquet Jubilee volume, Rome, 1917, pp. 68-74), saying: "We give thanks to Thee, O God, and offer Thee these first-fruits which Thou hast given us to enjoy," etc. There follows a list of fruits that can be "blessed" and certain flowers that can be "offered"—

roses and lilies only (Hauler, pp. 115-6).

(2) Similarly (following immediately after the canon in the Consecration Mass) come the words: "Whoever offers oil, in like manner according to the oblation of bread and wine yet not in the same words, but with the same force (si quis oleum offert, secundum panis oblationem et vini et non ad sermonem dicat sed simili virtute gratias referat dicens: Ut oleum hoc sanctificans das, Deus, etc.), let him (= the Bishop) return thanks, saying," etc. A similar prayer follows for cheese and olives, together with a general doxology for all such

^{*} I am following the pagination of Connolly, The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents, Cambridge, 1916.

"benedictions" (Hauler, pp. 107-8). The general rule is: In omnibus quæ percipiuntur sancto Deo gratias agant in gloriam ejus percipientes (ibid., p. 116).* These blessings of cheese, oil, and olives are, however, very likely of later date than the first-fruit benediction: the latter thanks God for the article; in the blessing for cheese and olives God is asked to "sanctify the coagulated milk" and the oil. The first-fruits prayer has interesting linguistic affiliation with St. Hippolytus' language elsewhere—e.g., Philosophoumena, ix. 30; and with Didache, v. 3, where the sanction for such a prayer may possibly be found: "Thou hast given food and drink unto man for their enjoyment that they may give thanks to Thee" (cf. also 1 Tim. vi. 17).

(3) The section "Concerning Widows and Virgins, and at what time the Bishop should fast" has not survived in the Latin, but, fortunately, we possess the Greek text of the passage (Vindob. hist., 7), as well as a version in Sahidic (Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum, Paderborn, 1905, ii., p. 112; cf. Horner, op. cit., p. 157), and a derived text in the Canons of Hippolytus, 32. The gist of the passage is to the following effect: while widows, virgins, and presbyters may fast whenever, and as often as they wish, the bishop may not, save when all the people observe a fast. For some "one may wish to offer (προσενεγκεῦν) and he may not refuse" (i.e., to say the blessing) for "always he who breaks (the bread) must partake." The solid Jewish groundwork of this must be assumed without demonstration. The significant allusion is to the people

"offering" = sacrificing.

(4) The Agape customs are in A.T. of a double tradition. (a) The Latin is given in Statute 37 (beginning defective; Connolly, pp. 187-8): "Let exorcized bread be given to the catechumens, and let each (of them) offer (the) cup. Let not a catechumen recline at the Lord's Supper (in cena dominica). At such oblation let him who eats [a case where offert obviously has understood the middle of προσφέρειν in the sense of the active, as is clear from the Ethiopic and Coptic parallels: προσφερόμενος = eats; προσφέρων = offers, as Schwartz, op. cit., p. 40, n. 1, pointed out] be mindful of him who invited him," etc. Rules are laid down for the meal—food is either to be consumed there or taken home (cf. also the case of widows who are to be given food and wine to be consumed at home; Hauler, p. 115, Connolly, p. 189); their behaviour is regulated. To those not present the host can send tamquam de reliquiis sanctorum. They must preserve decorum in the Bishop's presence, or if he do not preside, the presbyter's or deacon's. * Cf. 1 Cor. x. 31; Gal. iii. 17; Eph. v. 20, etc.

"Let everyone be prompt to take from the presbyter's or deacon's hand the εὐλογία," while the catechumen is to receive exorcized (bread). A layman may not make the eulogia. (b) The Ethiopic (Horner, pp. 160-1) gives us probably a local supper-rite, quite different from the Latin. It is entitled, "Concerning the bringing in of lamps at the supper of the congregation." It is introduced by the formulæ of the Preface, save that "Lift up your hearts" is not said "because that shall be said at the Oblation." There is a prayer said by the Bishop over the lamp, brought in by the deacon; the children sing psalms; the deacon holds the "mingled cup of the Prosphora" and recites a Hallel Psalm, after which the Bishop offers the cup, and the congregation responds, "Hallelujah." He then gives thanks over the cup and distributes bread, which each believer is to take from his hand before his supper. This is "Eulogia and not Eucharist as the Body of the Lord."

(5) Of the union between the Sacrifice on the Cross and the Eucharist there is mention in the injunction to "pray at the third hour... because in that hour they stripped Christ and nailed Him to the cross: and therefore the ancient law commanded to give the bread which they offer at the third hour, as a type of the holy Body and Blood of Christ; and they sacrificed the lamb which was a type of the perfect Lamb, for Christ is the Shepherd, and He is the bread which came down from heaven" (Connolly, p. 192; not in Latin, but in Horner's

Ethiopic, ibid., p. 183).

The Eucharistic rite is told about in connection with the First Communion, and the canon itself is given in the Ordination service. We turn then to these, both represented by the Verona fragments. It is clear that Christianity is regarded as a religion with a sacrificial system. The terminology is explicitly sacerdotal. The Bishop's Ordination prayer includes the terms "to act as high-priest before Thee, to minister without blame unto Thee, to propitiate Thy countenance, to offer (before Thee) the gifts of Thy Holy Church," etc. (cf. Connolly, op. cit., pp. 18-19, where the Ethiopic and Latin of the A.T. are given in parallel with the Canons of Hippolytus, the Epitome, the Apost. Const., viii., and the Testament). Phrases like "to have the authority to forgive sins by the high-priestly Spirit" (ibid.) are paralleled by the Consecration Prayer, where the newly consecrated Bishop says: "Mindful therefore of His death and Resurrection we offer to Thee bread and the cup, giving thanks unto Thee for that Thou hast deigned us worthy to stand before Thee and act as priest unto Thee" (Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis ejus offerimus tibi panem et calicem gratias tibi agentes, quia nos dignos habuisti adstare

coram te et tibi ministrare, Hauler, p. 107). Lietzmann's reconstruction of the Greek (op. cit., pp. 174-5) for the last clause gives: ἐφ' οἶς καταξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἰστάναι ἐνώπιον σοῦ, καὶ ἰερατεύειν σοι (cf. his comment, pp. 135, 164, loc. cit.). Other relevant references are: the prayer of ordination of presbyter: ut credentes tibi ministremus* (Hauler, p. 109); the deacon is ordained by the bishop alone: quia non in sacerdotio ordinatur sed in ministerio episcopi (Hauler, pp. 109-110); he is one "quem elegisti ministrare ecclesiæ tuæ et offerre in thy Holy of Holies that which is offered by thine ordained Chief Priests to the glory of thy Name" (Connolly, p. 179); the "priesthood" is used in connection with the ordination of presbyters as distinguishing the ministry of the widow who "does not offer the sacrifice" (Statute 26; Horner, p. 147); the intercession for the sick of the Bishop, the princeps sacer-

dotum, is peculiarly efficacious (Hauler, pp. 116-7).

These words-offer, oblation-appear some thirty-two times in the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus. Of these thirtytwo, twenty are in the Latin Verona fragments. The word has various shades of meaning: (a) To "offer" in a non-sacrificial sense—as, e.g., the deacons "offer" the newly consecrated Bishop the "oblation" as all "offer" him the kiss of peace; the Faithful are to "offer" the kiss of peace to the newly baptized; like this is the passage in the prayer for ordination of a deacon—"that he offer in thy holy of holies that which is offered to thee by thine ordained Chief Priests," etc. So also (in the First Communion) the oblation is to be "offered" by the deacons to the Bishop. Here it may mean nothing more than "hand to," "convey to," "present to." † (b) To offer to God in general, not necessarily in a sacrificial sense: the "offering" of oil, cheese, olives, which the Bishop gives thanks over (actually himself making the oblation of these comestibles); so in the Greek fragment quoted by Lietzmann, p. 183, from Vindob. Hist., 7 (correcting the Ethiopic and Sahidic): "The Bishop may not fast save when all the folk do, since if one wish to offer, he may not deny him," for he must break his fast to partake of the offered food. The Latin agape uses the phrase: Per omnem oblationem memor sit qui edat (corrected from offert) ejus qui illum vocavit. The catechumens, given exorcized bread, are each to "offer" the cup, which

* In a Greek retranslation: ΐνα οἱ πιστεύοντες σοι ἱερατευῶμεν.

[†] So in the blessing of first-fruits: "omnes festinent offerre episcopo: qui autem offerit, benedicat, et nominet eum qui obtulit," etc. Further, "sed et aliquotiens et flores offeruntur. Offeratur ergo rosa et lilium et alia vero non." (In regard to the Paschal fast, oblatio is probably a mistake for πρὶν ἢ δεῖν προσφέρεσθαι [Copt. and Eth.; cf. Connolly, p. 190, note] in the passage: "Nemo in Pascha, antequam oblatio flat, percipiat.")

apparently means, to say grace. (c) To "offer"-metaphorically and figuratively speaking—e.g., the Bishop's consecration prayer: "to offer to thee the odour of sweetness," etc., and in the words (apropos of the sign of the cross): Donum enim spiritus et infusio lavacri, sicuti ex fonte corde credente cum offertur, sanctificat eum qui credidit.* (d) To "offer" and 'the oblation" in a sacerdotal and sacrificial sense. There is a narrowing and specifying terminology employed in this connection, which is abundantly apparent by a retranslation of the Latin-fortunately, slavishly literal for the most partback into the Greek with the help of the affiliated Greek documents—the Apost. Const., viii., and the Epitome. specifying and concrete term for the Eucharistic Oblation is the "gifts" or "the sacrifice" "of Thy Holy Church." (1) For example, in the Bishop's consecration prayer: "Da . . . super hunc servum tuum . . . pascere gregem sanctam tuam et primatum sacerdotii tibi exhibere . . . incessanter repropitiari vultum tuum et offerre dona sanctæ ecclesiæ tua, spiritu primatus sacerdotii, habere potestatem dimittere peccata . . . placere tibi in mansuetudine et mundo corde, offerentem tibi odorem suavitatis, per puerum," etc. The Greek (based upon Epitome and Apost. Const., controlled by the Latin): Δὸς . . . ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου . . . ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἀγίαν ποίμνην καὶ ἀρχιερατεύειν σοι, ἀδιαλείπτως έξιλασκόμενον σου τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς άγίας σου έκκλησίας, και τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν άφιέναι άμαρτίας . . . εὐχαριστεῖν δὲ σοι ἐν πραότητι καὶ καθαρά καρδία προσφέροντά σοι όσμην εύωδίας, δια τοῦ άγίου παιδός σου κ.τ.λ. (2) Again, in the canon, the words quoted before: memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis, etc., in Lietzmann's Greek reconstruction: Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς άναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομεν σοι τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον εύχαριστουντές σοι, έφ' οις καταξίωσας ήμας έστάναι ενώπιόν σου καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι. Καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ὅπως καταπέμψης τὸ άγιόν σου πνεύμα έπὶ τὴν θυσίαν τῆς (άγίας) ἐκκλησίας (ἡν) ένώσας κ.τ.λ. (ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ; in unum congregans des omnibus, etc.). (3) In the First Communion of the newly baptized, there is a significant and important rubrical section, the meaning of which is rendered unmistakable by the translation. The Latin (Hauler, p. 112) and the Greek reconstruction are here given in parallel columns for convenience. Some phrases in the latter part (as Dom Connolly, op. cit., p. 166, and Schwartz, Pseudoapost. Kirchenordn., p. 39, pointed out) have parallels in the (Georgian)

^{*} Cf. also the final section: on the sign of the cross—sicut loricam offerens (Connolly, op. cit., p. 193).

Blessing of Moses (cf. Bonwetsch, T.u.U., n. F., xi. 67) and in his Commentary on Gen. xlix. 15b.

Et tunc jam offeratur oblatio a diaconibus episcopo, et gratias agat panem quidem in exemplum, quod dicit Greecus antitypum, corporis Christi; calicem vino mixtum propter antitypum, quod dicit Græcus similitudinem, sanguinis, quod effusum est pro omnibus qui credide unt in eum; lac et melle mixta simul ad plenitudinem promissionis quæ ad patres fuit, quam dixit: "terram fluentem lac et mel," quam et dedit carnem suam Christus, per quam sicut parvuli nutriuntur qui credunt, in suavitate verbi amara cordis dulcia efficiens; aquam vero in oblationem in indicium layacri ut et interior homo, quod est animale, similia, consequatur sicut et corpus. it has board out tod!

καὶ τότε ήδη προσφερθήτω ή προσφορά ύπο των διακόνων τώ έπισκόπφ, καὶ εὐχαριστείτω τὸν μεν άρτον είς αντίτυπον τοῦ σώματος του Χριστού, τὸ δὲ κεκραμένον ποτήριον είς (διὰ τὸ?) ὁμοίωμα τοῦ αίματος τοῦ ἐκκεχυμένου ὑπὲρ πάντων των πιστευσάντων είς αὐτόν. Γάλα καὶ μέλι ἄμα συμμεμιγμένα διά την πλήρωσιν της επαγγελίας δοθείσης τοις πατράσιν ήν μεν έπηγγείλατο: 'γην ρέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι, ἡν δὲ ἔδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς την σάρκα αὐτοῦ [ἴνα] δι' αὐτης οί πιστεύοντες ώς παιδία τρέφωνται, γλυκαίνων [τέ] την πικρίαν της καρδίας εν γλυκύτητι του λόγου. τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ εἰς τὴν προσφορὰν, τοῦ σημάναι τὸ λουτρόν, ΐνα ὁ ἔσω άνθρωπος ός έστι ψυχικός, των ομοίων επιτύχη ώς και το σώμα.

(On this section, cf. Connolly, op. cit., pp. 83-94.)

The hierarchy is a fact, and it is in the A.T. a fact not to be contended for but assumed. The people may "offer," but the presbyter and bishops present the offering and "give thanks." This holds as well for the Agape as for the firstfruits and other viands (or flowers) "offered" to God. There is a distinction apparent between "offer" and "oblation" (if the text be certain) where related to laymen, and the same terms with reference to the clergy. The terms sacerdotium, and the Latin (and Greek) for "high-priestly," "chief-priesthood" belong to the genuine and indubitable Hippolytan text. Christianity has a "sacrifice" to offer, and it consists in that which becomes the "likeness" or the "anti-type" of the Body and Blood of Christ. The term sacrifice is used both narrowly and broadly, but the distinction between what is offered on the altar as the "oblation of the Church" and what is "offered" by the layman is maintained. Sacrifice $(=\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\sigma\rho\dot{\alpha}$ and $\theta\nu\sigma\dot{\alpha}$) is used par excellence of the Eucharistic gifts. The Eucharistic theology throws much light on Hippolytus' conception of sacrifice. Like all writers of the early centuries, "likeness," "similitude," "symbol," in some sense were what they resembled and symbolised. The difference between their outlook and our own, pointed out by Loofs and Harnack, must be kept in mind always: "What we understand

by 'symbol' is a thing which is not what it represents; at that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies."* The term eucharistein is, as in Justin Martyr, a transitive verb: "Let the Bishop eucharistize (!) the bread into the anti-type of the Body of Christ" is the only way in which we can convey the sense of the passage last mentioned. The Eucharistic prayer does something to the bread and wine which have been offered; in fact, the offering may be the prayer of Thanksgiving itself. In his rite, this commemoration would seem to be achieved by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit: "And we beseech Thee, to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice of Thy Holy Church, which do Thou unite, and give to all the saints who partake, unto the fulness of the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy servant Jesus Christ, through whom," etc. The underlying conception seems to be that of the infusion of the Holy Spirit into the bread and wine, by partaking of which the Spirit comes into the believers. As having become the Body and Blood of the Christ, His Spirit can by them be conveyed to the Faithful. A puzzling phrase precedes this: "We offer to Thee the bread and the cup, being mindful of His death and Resurrection, giving thanks unto Thee for that Thou hast deemed us worthy to stand before Thee and act as priest (ἱερατεύειν σοι for the Latin: tibi ministrare) unto Thee." Is this prayer itself the specific instance of the exercise of the priesthood? Has that priesthood already been exercised, in the use of the words of Thanksgiving, or is it conspicuously exerted in the section followingthe epiklesis, or Invocation of the Holy Spirit? When we keep in mind the extensive compass of the priestly functions for not even in the case of the eulogia (=the bread of the Agape) can a layman bless—its climax is surely to be found in this conjunction of the offered bread and wine which the celebrant is to "give thanks into the antitype of the Body, and the likeness (similitude) of His Blood."

A word may be said as to the importance of this Liturgy in the stream of the liturgical Tradition of the Church. While the author gives his canon as a sample, he carefully notes that the Bishop need not confine himself to it (see discussion in Conolly, op. cit., pp. 64-66, and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 35). Nevertheless, this prayer has had a unique and remarkable history. The liturgy of Apost. Const., viii., prefaces to it a section (borrowed from the synagogue) of thanksgiving for the acts of God to man, a kind of summary of the O.T., ending

^{*} Harnack, D.G., i., pp. 435-6; Loofs in R.E. (Leipzig, 1896), i., p. 58; Weinel, Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister, p. 212, etc.

with the Sanctus (which is absent in the A.T.). The liturgy of Hippolytus is incorporated whole and entire into this Antiochene fourth-century document. In short, as Lietzmann states: "On it is based the Antiochene Liturgy of the fourth century, of which a significant type lies before us in Apost. Const., viii. (and ii.). From this Antiochene formulation the Byzantine Liturgy evolved . . . those of Basil and the later St. Chrysostom's . . . which are still in use. It is the model for all liturgies still known to us" (op. cit., p. 261). It is consistent, in all known and discernible traces, with that of St. Justin, so is undoubtedly of the second century in substance. The ratification, so to speak, by the widely separated sections of Christianity and its adoption by West and East alike give it a peculiar pre-eminence which, in a measure, justifies the attention I have given it in this survey.

The one apparent exception to the dominance of the A.T. type is the Liturgy of St. Serapion—a contemporary of St. Athanasius. Lietzmann urges, with some plausibility, that it derives from a Didache type, by comparison with which he dissects out the supposed original kernel. It is difficult to agree with his theory, which—if the Didache be not a book for liturgical worship and clerical use, but rather a congregational manual—lacks any support whatever. In the main we have the elements of the A.T. represented, but in different sequence,

in Serapion:

A.T.

- 1. Thanksgiving.
- 2. Institution-narrative.
- 3. Memorial and oblation.
- 4. Invocation.
- 5. Petition.

Serapion.

- 1. Thanksgiving (ending with Sanctus).
- 2. Invocation.
- 3. Institution-narrative.
 - 4. Oblation.
 - 5. Petition.

The one element lacking in Serapion is the "memorial," (memores igitur mortis, etc.). There seems to be no known case of a Eucharistic Liturgy where the rite does not contain an account of the Institution. The apparent exceptions are (1) Didache, the evidence of which I have already discussed, and (2) the so-called Nestorian rite. As to the latter, we possess in Aphraates (after middle of the fourth century) an indubitable Eucharistic narrative of the Institution, so there is no exception known to us to this rule.

The significance of the Institution-narrative is to establish and vindicate the very essence of the Eucharist as in some measure a sacrifice. What our Lord did, the Church does;

His self-oblation is the authority for its re-enactment or representation (even without the words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε είς τὴν έμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). As He gave thanks, the Church, His mystical Body, gives thanks. As His sacred words "This is my Body" in some way connected with the bread and wine His selfoblation of Body and Blood, His new relationship to His mystical Body, the Fellowship of believers, made possible the effective memorial of that His consummate act of self-sacrifice. He said two things: the Thanksgiving, and the probably two single words "This . . . my Body." At an early date in the Church's history the Thanksgiving was conceived to be that which, effected the second part—"This . . . my Body." Hence, by a simple and inevitable development, "Thanking-God-for" becomes "Thanks-said-over" the bread and wine, which, having thus been treated, are the φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτον τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός (Ignatius, Eph., 20, 2, which Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 257, n. 2, regards as a liturgical formula. It appears in Serapion, Anaphora, 13, 15; Gallican, Lit. in Mone, iii., p. 21: sit sumentibus etc.; Berlin Papyrus, etc.). The Elements used in the service are themselves the "Eucharist" (Ignatius, Phil. 4, and Smyrn., 7, 1), which is "the flesh of our Saviour which suffered for our sins" (Smyrn., 7, 1). This technical use of the noun occurs as well in Did. ix., 5 (" eat or drink of your Eucharist").* The Eucharist is a sacrifice (Did., xiv., 1, 2, 3), and Mal. i. 11, 14 is quoted as prophetic foreshowing of it, as here and in Just., Tryph. 41: "The bread of the Eucharist and the cup likewise of the Eucharist were predicted as the sacrifices in every place offered by us Gentiles." As with the noun so with the verb, a subtle but inevitable transformation has occurred: the "thanked-over" bread and wine, as we have seen, Justin says, are the Body and Blood of Christ (1 Apol. 65, 66), and the same thought appears in the A.T. In fact, Justin's description in 1 Apol. 65 follows, detail by detail, and in many actual words, the rite given in the A.T.

This primitive interpretation and commentary upon the evangelical accounts and the Pauline tradition is, at the very least, congruent with them. The sequence of steps in the process is both logical and, historically speaking, inevitable. Unless a sacramental view of the Pauline and Johannine teaching be deliberately excluded, at least in their larger context as the first precipitate of Christian tradition they are more than patient of this interpretation. On independent grounds many scholars find in both St. Paul and St. John, not to speak of the Synoptists, sure and certain evidence of what is called

^{*} So also in Justin 1 M., Apol., 66.

the sacramental outlook the most significant for not being advocated but assumed. It is needless to point to the abundant ratification of this general view—as to the Church, its ministry as a representative but nevertheless a sacerdotal priesthood, with a sacrifice offered to God for men by and in the Church, a doctrine of, or rather an attitude toward, the Eucharist which, while it is within the category of sacrament and sacrifice, includes all the other views and attitudes—as a fellowshipmeal, as a commemoration, as a means of communion, and the like—all this and more is meant by the age-long validity of the corporate Catholic experience, if you will call it so, of Christianity. It is numerically and historically preponderantly powerful, both day before yesterday, yesterday, and today. It may not be left to one side or safely disregarded. It is too vital to too many millions of past and present Christians. It cannot be whittled down or explained away; as a pregnant interpretation of the meaning and the acts of Jesus Christ our Lord, as a controlling way of life conditioning habits of thought and act, as a means of religious experience in which countless saints and holy ones have been nurtured and flowered, and as a possibly sole-inclusive outlook on the problem of reunion, its verdict and convictions must be allowed for and adequately understood.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The essential ingredients of the Eucharistic rite, as well of the N.T. accounts as of early Christian usage, derive from Judaism.

2. These antecedents are of two types: (a) The Kiddush meal of the haburah, with accompanying customs and ceremonies, the "blessing" or Thanksgiving—εὐχαριστία, etc.; and (b) the sacrificial system of Rabbinic Judaism, concerning

which we lack precise information.

3. The early records of Christianity suggest the derivation of two kinds of solemn fellowship-meal from (a) the "Miraculous Feedings" stories, with them as the intense instances of fellow ship-meals with the Lord Jesus; and (b) the unique events of the Passion: the Institution on Maundy Thursday night, the Crucifixion, and the subsequent Resurrection, respectively. They are (1) the Agape and (2) the Eucharist.

4. While the two observances were often coincidental in time (as in 1 Cor. xi., surviving to a late period in Alexandria, e.g., the writings of Clement Alex.), there was a sharp distinction between them; the Eucharist possessed a definitive and technical terminology and an established and unique

position (e.g., in St. Ignatius there is no trace of a distinctive Agape); it was early termed a "sacrifice," and its development gave rise to a peculiar and typical cycle of word-ideas, e.g., eucharistein as a transitive verb; the noun eucharistia to mean (a) the service, or (b) the Elements after prayer over them (so in the Didache).

5. The element of oblation, offering, sacrifice, is latent wherever—as always either explicitly or implicitly—the words "Body" and "Blood" are used of the prayed-over Elements. The sacrificial quality of the rite and, inevitably—in its development and growth—of the ministers, is never absent, and gains in explicitness along with the development of Christology.

6. Whereas εὐχαριστείν and εὐχαριστία in technical connotation were never dislodged from their original place, along with the more original and primitive conceptions thereto associated came, by a more self-conscious process of theologizing, the emphasis on the Spirit's share in the Christian mystery of the Eucharist. The ἐπίκλησις—or direct invocation of God to send His Spirit, or of the Spirit to come—rests upon an early combination of two ideas: the Pauline (2 Cor. iii. 17) and Johannine (vi. 63) doctrine of the Lordship of the Spirit (=Christ in the Heavenlies) in association with the latent deduction concerning spirit-infused food (βρῶμα πνευματικὸν) and drink (πόμα πνευματικόν, 1 Cor. x. 3, 4). The deduction is: the bread and wine become Body and Blood by virtue of the advent of the Spirit whose coming into them makes them spirit-infused οτ πνευματικόν. The terms εὐχαριστία or εὐλογία came in time (third-fifth centuries) to be regarded loosely as synonymous with ἐπίκλησις, as Dom Odo Casel has contended.

7. While we have in Justin and A.T. the primitive ascription to the act of εὐχαριστεῖν as rendering the bread and wine no longer such simply, we have in the latter the ordered and logical development of the doctrine of the Spirit's function alongside; while the Bishop is to "thank the bread into the likeness of the Body of Christ," he also prays that God "send His Holy Spirit into the Oblation of the Holy Church." (Liturgically speaking, Western and Eastern traditions as to the moment of consecration both derive from this blended

type of Eucharistic rite.)

8. Meanwhile explicitness as to the sacrificial ministry has come about: the individual Christian "offers" as an "oblation" what he dedicates to the use of God no less than of man—food, drink, first-fruits, flowers—but the consummation of the Oblation is achieved by the thanksgiving prayer of the ecclesiastic. "Eucharist" has now extended its scope to comprise this dedicatory and consecratory sacerdotal act. It means

"blessing," in fact, in the later sense of the word: a blessing

not of God for the thing blest, but by God of the thing.

9. So inevitably consistent is the development as indicated by the progressive steps of the process here sketched out, that it would be superfluous as well as impracticable to deny to the later conclusions of the series the mark of legitimacy. (a) As a fact it must be reckoned with. (b) As an interpretation of the central core of the earliest precipitate of the Christian tradition—the strata represented by the different accounts of the N.T. writers—it may not be repudiated as unjustified or as perverted. (c) As having the weight of confirmatory experience and universality in the corporate life of the Christian Fellowship, it possesses a unique and peculiar authority. Within the embrace of the whole cycle there is place for every other save the negating and repudiative—conception of the Eucharist that has gained ascendancy in any particular section of the Christian world. Such verdicts have their due weight, but do not possess that of universal ascendancy, continuous and dynamic tradition or preponderance of witness.

THE REVOLUTION IN MODERN SCIENCE

THE publication of The Nature of the Physical World by Sir Arthur Eddington caused as much consternation among rationalists as the appearance of The Origin of Species provoked

among mid-Victorian bishops.

It was bad enough that a scientist of European standing should assert that modern scientific discoveries have banished "strict causality," and with strict causality the very foundations of Victorian materialism, from the material world. It was intolerable that Sir Arthur Eddington should proceed to prove that Naturalism is bankrupt, and supernaturalism by far the most plausible explanation of the great riddle.

There is a touch of wistful bravado in the cri de cœur of Mr. Cohen, the editor of The Freethinker. "I have been knocking down God Almighty for thirty years. You cannot expect that after knocking down God Almighty I am going to jib at Professor Eddington." Mr. Cohen may not jib at Professor Eddington, but the man in the street, who is far too easily influenced by the pronouncements of the scientists, is beginning to jib at Mr. Cohen.

The man in the street is, of course, less impressed by the merits of an argument than by the credentials of the arguer.

He would have ignored Eddington's views had they been expressed by a bishop, but he sits up and takes notice when a prominent scientist attacks the creed associated with Victorian science.

In this respect there is little to choose between the attitude of the man in the street and the attitude of the average Churchman. The churches are more infected than they might care to confess by that modern superstitious reverence for the pronouncements of scientists, not only on science, but on all other subjects as well. Sir Arthur Eddington's views on religion are of great interest, not because he is a scientist with a European

reputation, but because he is a very able philosopher.

Compare Huxley's attempt to prove the all-sufficiency of Naturalism as an explanation of both physical and mental phenomena, and Eddington's brilliant attack on Naturalism and convincing defence for supernaturalism, and you must inevitably contrast not only the scientific attainments of Huxley and Eddington, but also their philosophic acuteness. We may be unconvinced by Eddington, but even Mr. Cohen himself would have an uneasy feeling that Huxley ought to have anticipated Eddington's line of attack. Eddington's argument owes nothing, beyond an occasional illustration, to science. He is more convincing than Huxley, not because he is a better scientist, but because he is a more profound and a more logical philosopher.

It is undignified of Churchmen to adopt an attitude of selfcongratulation if a distinguished scientist appears as a defender of the Faith. It would be far more fitting for the Churches to indite a dignified letter of congratulation to the Royal Society on such welcome evidence of the return of science to sanity. It is, of course, all to the good that the flight from Reason should be arrested, and it is very right and proper for fugitives to be guided back to sanity by scientists, for scientists were,

in the first instance, responsible for the flight itself.

Again, there is a real danger in basing the defence of enduring truths on the passing scientific fashion of the moment. It is a mistake to suggest that our belief in freewill is really strengthened by the fact that determinism is gradually disappearing from science. "Strict causality," writes Sir Arthur Eddington, "is abandoned in the material world. Our ideas of the controlling laws are in process of reconstruction, and it is not possible to predict what kind of form they will ultimately take; but all the indications are that strict causality has dropped out permanently. This relieves the former necessity of supposing that mind is subject to deterministic law or alternatively that it can suspend deterministic law in the material world. . . .

Pagest translation realizable as it

If our expectations should prove well founded that 1927 has seen the final overthrow of strict causality by Heisenberg, Bohr, Born, and others, the year will certainly rank as one of the greatest epochs in the development of scientific philosophy."

It is, of course, all to the good that science in A.D. 1927 should admit a truth of which, no doubt, Pithecanthropus had some dim perception, and which has been accepted for centuries as a fundamental verity of Catholic philosophy. But I, for one, am not prepared to pin my faith in freewill to the researches of

Messrs. Heisenberg, Born, and others.

Sir Arthur Eddington tells us that "his apprehension that the fourth version of the new quantum theory should appear before the lectures were delivered was not fulfilled." None the less, I think theologians should refrain from basing their apologetics on the third version of the quantum theory. It is a great mistake to hitch one's waggon to a shooting star.

II

The old guard of Victorian materialists have long regarded science as their natural ally and consequently resented Sir Arthur Eddington's attack as a treacherous onslaught. "Et tu, Brute!" they cry with poignant sincerity. We are all creatures of habit, and the freethinker who is protected by the routine of fixed thought from the painful necessity of thinking freely, has a legitimate grievance against Sir Arthur Eddington. It is, for instance, extremely trying to be forced to revise those old-fashioned sermons on cosmic humility which enjoyed such continuous popularity among the more devout rationalists. "The Medieval Christian," so ran the simple tale, "lived in a small and friendly universe of which the earth was the centre and the pivot. Man was Lord of Creation, the sun shone to warm him, and the earth was created to serve as his dwellingplace during that brief period of probation in which his eternal destiny was decided. Modern science has shattered this snug cosmogony. Science teaches that we are the inhabitants of an insignificant planet revolving round an insignificant star. The universe is doubtless full of countless solar systems, many of which are far more splendid than our own. Science forbids us to assume that in all this vast universe our planet has been signalled out as the home of intelligent beings. The realization of this fact should fill our minds with awe, and inspire us with that true humility which it is the mission of science to promote. The Christian cosmogony belongs to a primitive stage in human development, and the creeds which are based on that outworn cosmogony cannot long survive the attacks of science. Science, like a glorious sun, is busily engaged in dispelling the clouds of outworn superstition," etc.

That sort of thing wrote itself, which was very restful.

It must be vastly painful to Mr. Cohen to realize that modern science confirms the cosmogony of the medieval Christian.

Sir Arthur Eddington, who speaks with unrivalled authority as an astronomer, assures us that a solar system is a freak which could only be formed if a very unusual accident occurred at a particular stage of condensation. The accident in question must have been the close approach of another star, which by tidal distortion caused the sun to spurt out filaments of matter which condensed to form planets. "Even in the long life of the star," he continues, "encounters of this kind must be extremely rare. The density of distribution of stars in space has been compared to that of twenty tennis balls roaming the whole interior of the earth. The accident that gave birth to the solar system may be compared to the casual approach of two of these balls within a few yards of each other. The data are too vague to give any definite estimate of the odds against this occurrence, but I should judge that perhaps not one in a hundred millions of stars can have undergone this experience in the right stage and conditions to result in the formation of a system of planets." And he adds, "I feel inclined to claim that at the present time our race is supreme; and not one of the profusion of stars in their myriad clusters looks down on scenes comparable to those which are passing beneath the rays of the sun.'

Cosmic humility must, therefore, give place to cosmic pride. So far, so good. This volte face of science will encourage those who share Mr. Belloc's belief that he may yet live "until that perhaps immediate day when the fantastic figures of astronomy will burst and the stars will be at reasonable distances again; as they are even now to a friend of mine who estimates the sun at twelve miles, the moon at twenty, and all the stars at a common distance (about a hundred miles) from the earth; and, firm in this faith, is as happy as one can be in this world."

\mathbf{III}

The Victorian atom has shared the fate of Victorian cosmogony. I am sorry to see the atom go. The Victorian atom was a friendly, concrete little fellow which I much prefer to the shadowy mist of unintelligible symbols which take the place of the atom in modern physics.

The atom was certainly worked very hard by the Victorian materialists. The Victorian, having got rid of God, was very

puzzled to account for the beginnings of consciousness, and finally decided that the atom, in addition to its other duties, must be endowed with a kind of consciousness. The atom was regarded as the continuum of immortal life, the only eternal and

immortal thing in the universe.

Thought was considered to be a by-product produced by the interplay of atoms in the brain. "It was," as Sir Arthur Eddington has pointed out, "the boast of the Victorian physicist that he would not claim to understand a thing until he could make a model of it; and by a model he meant something constructed by levers, geared wheels, squirts, or other appliances familiar to an engineer."

A material brain obviously suggested a ready-made model of the mind. "And being a model, it was for them" (the Victorian physicists) "the full explanation of the mind. A mechanism of concrete particles, like the billiard-ball atoms of

the brain, was their idea of an explanation."

The modern physicist does not try to explain the æther or the electron "in terms of billiard balls or fly-wheels or anything concrete; he will point instead to a number of symbols and a set of mathematical equations which they satisfy. What do the symbols stand for? The mysterious reply is given that physics is indifferent to that; it has no means of probing beneath the symbolism. To understand the phenomena of the physical world it is necessary to know the equations which the symbols obey, but not the nature of that which is being symbolized."

And here it is necessary to insert a warning note. There are people who seem to think that the dissolution of the atom from a small billiard ball into a shadowy mist of mathematical symbols strengthens the case against materialism. Of course, they are wrong. The arguments for and against materialism are entirely unaffected by the nature of matter. The essence of materialism is the belief, not that matter is necessarily solid, but that there is no fundamental distinction between mental and physical phenomena. Science is metrical knowledge, and the materialistic fallacy consists in the assumption that all knowledge is ultimately metrical. The argument between the materialist and his opponents is entirely unaffected by our view as to the nature of the atom, the ether, or the electron. The only effect of the new outlook of physics on the religious problem is, as Sir Arthur Eddington observes, "that we are no longer tempted to condemn the spiritual aspects of our nature as illusory because of their lack of concreteness. We have travelled far from the standpoint which identifies the real with the concrete."

Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan, one of the most attractive of modern writers on science, contributed on April 13, 1930, to *The Observer* a profoundly interesting review on the present outlook of science. He began by alluding to the disconcerting fact that the actual status of physical science is a matter of dispute among scientists themselves, who are by no means agreed as to the real aim and character of science. In order to throw a little light on this problem Mr. Sullivan interviewed the actual creators of the quantum and relativity theories of Professors Planck and Einstein, and also discussed these theories with Professor Schrödinger, a leading authority on the new views of matter.

Professor Schrödinger was convinced that something like freewill was the basis of all natural phenomena. Planck and Einstein were emphatic in rejecting "the freewill theory of the universe," and apparently on this point Mr. Sullivan found their personalities more convincing than their arguments. He says, "These men possess a sort of scientific wisdom which often cannot be supported by reasoned arguments, but which is, nevertheless, pretty well infallible. Einstein, in one of his most interesting remarks, acknowledged that some of his scientific judgments are based, not on reason, but on feelings." It is interesting to observe Newman's "illative sense" turning up again, this time not in support of theological, but of scientific faith.

Planck then proceeded to develop the interesting theme that science "is a constructed work of art, expressing a certain side of man's nature. Another side is expressed in art and religion." Sullivan objected that science differs from art, in that science gives us a knowledge of objective reality. Professor Planck promptly countered by asking what reason Mr. Sullivan had to suppose that "art and religion did not give us such knowledge." Science is an art, he insisted, and the fact that it also gives us "objective knowledge" is an indication that art and religion also do so. Einstein went even further than Planck in insisting on the affinities between science and religion. Mr. Sullivan concludes his profoundly interesting article with the reminder that modern science has entirely disowned Victorian materialism.

"In the new universe, it appears, our religious insight is granted as great validity as our scientific insight. Indeed, in the opinion of the greatest creator of them all, our religious insight is the source and guide of our scientific insight."

lacrowle achieved double turnsplant metared for believes ave

representative the frequency between the effections with the

ARNOLD LUNN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have received a copy of the fourth revised edition of Dr. Harris's Pro Fide (John Murray, 15s. net). First published in 1903, this book has met a widespread demand, to which the notices in the secular no less than the religious press bear witness. It is a work of deep and varied learning, and yet is essentially simple owing to the precision with which its arguments and conclusions are presented. It is safe to say that no important movement in modern thought is omitted from its wide survey, and each is described with scrupulous fairness; while throughout the whole there runs the golden thread of the Christian Faith, fervently believed, clearly comprehended, and robustly vindicated as the truth about God, the world, and man.

We are glad to extend a welcome to a new contemporary, edited by C. E. Hudson and published by the S.P.C.K., under the title of *The Teaching Church Review*. It is to appear terminally at the modest price of 6d.; and the arrangement shows that it has in mind particularly those, whether teachers or students, who keep terms at college. The current number contains interesting contributions from Mr. H. G. Wood and the Rev. J. H. B. Mace; Dr. Lowther Clarke contributes a useful bibliography for students of the Gospels; and there are Notes on Church Tutorial Classes, Sunday School work, etc. Altogether a very encouraging first number.

NOTES

I.—" OPUS DEI"

THE Church of England has but few devotional directions for her children, and makes very small demands of either her clergy or her lay-folk. She does, however, ask that Fridays and certain Vigils shall be observed by all, and that her priests shall recite the Daily Offices. (See "Rubric, concerning the Service of the Church.") Where little is asked for, there as a rule still less is given, so laity and clergy neglect the fast days and the priests their Offices, and neither pauses to consider how God is thus being robbed of the honour due to His Name. Since "to obey is better than sacrifice" must be a principle of primary importance, there is surely here a serious failure of duty. The obligation of saying Matins and Evensong, either privately or in public, by the clergy, being stressed at a clerical meeting, a priest made the reply in a quiet and perfectly contented voice: "That rubric has never appealed to me." The idea that being disobedient to the rule of the Church could in any way be doing God a wrong had never occurred to him.

The excuse for not saying the Office daily in public is of course that the people will not attend. In answer it might well be hinted that the priest should lead the people, carrying the light to show the way, rather than be contented to be a signpost pointing out the right path, but not ever moving along it. It might further be suggested that the

people's neglect is no excuse for a like neglect on his part, nor would he apply such an argument in the matter of any other sin—e.g., if the people gave way to insobriety, would the priest therefore be excused

occasionally indulging a little too freely?

The reason is deeper than this. The real secret of this neglect is that the duty is viewed from a mistaken standpoint. It is a duty owing to God, but it is regarded as a duty owing to man. The predominant thought is ministering to the congregation, while it should be speaking to God. By adopting the eastward position at the altar and re-arranging our choir-stalls, etc., we have to a certain extent obliterated this idea, but we have much yet to improve. The prayers and other parts of the Offices are yet often read in a pleasantly colloquial style perfectly adapted to addresses to the people, but equally unfit for expression of adoration or petition before the Almighty. If a petition to King George were expressed in such familiar tones, the deputation would certainly be informed that it could not be received in the future till it had acquired better manners.

It is this sense of God's presence that has grown so dim among us today, and has very sadly affected the practice of reciting the Daily Offices. A complaint often is, that after many years Matins and Evensong become monotonous, mechanical, wearisome, and unedifying, and that the time might be spent in prayers more tending to produce loving emotion towards the Person of our Lord and Saviour. Yet, as suggested by Dr. Liddon, "this will hardly counter-balance the consideration that obedience is a surer test of love than emotion. Like her Divine Master, the Church says to her priests, 'If ye love me keep my com-

mandments."

In the Incarnation God "was made flesh and dwelt among us." Now it is in the Church that the Divine Spirit dwells, so that the Church is truly, by St. Paul, termed His body mystical. A body must have a voice, and at Pentecost He manifested Himself to her under the expressive symbol of tongues of fire. Ever since He has dwelt in His favoured bride so that He prompts her prayers, her desires, her canticles of praise, and even her mourning. Daily must her voice be sounding sweetly in the ear of her Divine Spouse, and her words are ever finding a welcome in His heart. The official prayers of the Church are therefore most pleasing to the ear and heart of God, and are the most efficacious of all prayers. Happy, then, is the priest who prays in the words of the Church, and unites his own devotions with those of the bride, so dear to her Lord, that He gives her all that she asks. For this reason Christ taught us to say our Father, and not my Father; give us, not give me; forgive us, deliver us, and not forgive me, or deliver me. The priest reciting his Daily Office may be alone indeed physically, but in reality never alone, for he is one with the countless multitude who in this liturgical prayer are continually pleading and adoring in the words of their spiritual mother.

However, if the routine feeling is insurmountable—and the danger is not certainly insignificant—then why not make a brave effort to master the complications of what was once called the "Pie," of which the Book of Common Prayer declares that "the manifold changing of the service was the cause, that to turn the book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out." So great was

this difficulty in the eyes of the sixteenth-century revisers that they abandoned the attempt to unravel it, and provided a more simple arrangement which is now neglected on the ground of sameness and wearisome monotony. It is not easy to improve on the spiritual nourishment which the wisdom of the Church, and the experience of her saints, through long ages, had found to be very satisfying to the soul. The sacred cycle of the mysteries of the Christian year and the faithful attendance to the teachings of the Spirit were a true and real help to eternal life. The psalmist sings "Seven times a day do I praise Thee," and for so godly a habit the Breviary provides the fitting forms of service in lessons and canticles from the Scriptures and in collects appropriate to varying feast and fast days.

For those who prefer the "vulgar tongue" there are several translations from the Latin, some following the Roman rite and some the Sarum. The plan and scope is simple (pace the Book of Common Prayer), and a short study can master it with ease, more especially if it is borne in mind that the object of the book is an intelligent act of worship

and not a mere prayer-wheel contrivance.

Each Office is an echo of the early Eucharist, and reflects the tone and character of the day—e.g., the Collect of the Mass is used throughout the day at five out of the Seven Hours. The antiphons all reflect the teaching of that particular feast or fast which is being observed. The short chapters, from Scripture, give the same directing thought. Into this frame is fitted the psalms and canticles which have been ever the joy and comfort of the Faithful in their pilgrimage through this life. This Liturgical Prayer is a divine property showing that the Church knows well the true secret of prayer.

The Canonical Hours help to keep vivid the dogma of God's presence in His Church. The use of them is now irregular and intermittent and the dogma, in consequence, dim. In the Seven "Hours" of the Church is to be found a very rich formula of public prayer in which all (but particularly the clergy) can sing on earth the mysteries of heaven

and learn a preparation for the canticles of eternity.

H. M. WELLINGTON.

II.—THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG

Confessio Augustana is the title of a brief but stimulating collection of essays on the Confession of Augsburg, written by Prof. Heiler and a number of pastors and scholars who have collaborated with him in the pages of the Hochkirche. The C.A. has, of course, a special interest for the Church of England because of the influence which it exercised on our own Articles. Many other pamphlets have been written this year on the same subject, among which we should like to mention Prof. W. Vollrath's pamphlet entitled "The Confession of Augsburg and its Meaning for the Present Day," but most of them have ignored the original purpose of the C.A. Prof. Heiler and his colleagues make it perfectly clear that the C.A. was an irenicon, a peace-document which was intended to serve the purpose of restoring the broken unity of the Church. He quotes Melanchthon's letter written to Cardinal Campeggio on July 6, 1530, in which Melanchthon affirms that "we are solely desirous of peace and concord and do not reject any tolerable condition for making peace. We have no dogma different from the Roman Church."

Prof. Heiler deals with the subject under three heads: (1) The origin and history of the Confession. (2) The contents of the Confession.

(3) The meaning of the Confession for the present day.

The historical facts are well known, and call for little comment. We know that the Confession was mainly compiled by Philip Melanchthon, and read at the Diet of Augsburg on June 25, 1530. It is clear that the C.A. was doomed to failure from the start. Luther confessed that he could not "walk so meekly and so silently," and the Protestant princes shrank from making too many concessions to Rome. The Catholics applauded the agreements with, but denounced the divergences from, Roman doctrine. They were therefore obliged to draw up their Confutatio Pontificia, but refused to show it to the Evangelical state representatives unless they accepted it as a final decision.

The C.A. had the general purpose of proving the orthodoxy and catholicity of the Evangelicals. It accepted the tradition of the Fathers of the Church as well as Scripture, and acknowledged the authority of General Councils. Prof. Heiler points out that the sacramental character of confirmation, priestly ordination, and unction of the sick, is nowhere denied, and not even the primacy of Rome is disputed. In the articles on Justification, the C.A. rightly declares that salvation cannot be merited, but is a free gift of God's grace, but takes a rather limited view of faith as fides informis, and of the effect of Justification as forgiveness of sins

apart from sanctification and union with Christ.

The C.A. agrees in the main with the Catholic doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. The Church is the congregatio sanctorum, but it is visible on earth not only in men, but in its objective institutions, in word and sacrament. The C.A. recognizes Baptism, Holy Communion, and Confession as the three sacraments, but does not reject the sacramental character of other rites—e.g., Ordination. The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion is affirmed, but no definite attitude is taken towards Transubstantiation. Private Confession is retained, but the enumeration of all sins is declared to be unnecessary. In the second part of the C.A., regarding abuses, three positive reforms are put forward—communion in two kinds, marriage of priests, and abolition of private masses. It is somewhat contemptuous of monastic vows, but it rightly recognizes the spiritual, not temporal, power of the bishops—Melanchthon cherished the earnest wish that after the restoration of peace the authority of the bishops should remain unimpaired.

If we consider the meaning of the C.A. for the present day, it must be admitted that modern Protestantism in Germany is opposed to or separated from it. But Prof. Heiler thinks that it may still possess some importance for the Protestant as a peace document, and for the Roman Catholics as a warning against abuses. It has a special value for the High Church Union in their work for the restoration of the unity of the Church. This reunion will not be attained by negotiations with the Roman hierarchy, but by a détour through the Eastern Church. The High Church Union must give a practical proof of the compatibility of the Evangelical faith with the full Catholic tradition, and then the Orthodox Church of the East will hold out the hand of brotherhood. There are many in the Church of England who are working for reunion on the same lines, and we trust that their hopes will be fulfilled.

We can only refer briefly to the essays of Prof. Heiler's collaborators. Pastor G. Dietrich emphasizes Melanchthon's desire for peace and unity,

which, he says, is shown by making the Church the centre of the whole Confession. "The Church is the assembly of the faithful, in which the Gospel is rightly preached and the sacraments are rightly administered." This inward unity consists in agreement about three points: (1) The faith in the triune God. (2) The right administration of the Sacraments. (3) The right "doctrine" of the Gospel, which means the preaching of salvation through Christ.

Paul Schorlemmer deals with the liturgical question, and declares that evangelical freedom consists in variety. The Confession points to the fact that it is not necessary that traditions and rites should be always

and everywhere the same.

We hope that this pamphlet will stir up German Lutherans to think more deeply and earnestly about the problems of faith and reunion.

L. PATTERSON.

III.—THE IMPORTANCE OF DREAMS

(Communicated)

Several good judges have stated their conviction that Mr. J. W. Dunne's An Experiment with Time (London, 1927) is likely to have a permanent effect on scientific, and so ultimately on popular, thought.

Mr. Dunne's philosophy starts from dreams of the future; he has kept records of remarkable dreams for many years. One example must suffice. In 1902 he dreamed of the Martinique volcanic eruption. Many of the details were right. The loss of life in the dream was 4,000. This was not the correct number, or even the number as first stated. The newspaper recording the news reached him some time after the event, when he was in an isolated part of Africa. Its headline gave 40,000 as the feared loss of life. Reading hastily, Mr. Dunne took this to be 4,000, and such remained his impression for some time. His dream, to put it as simply as possible, anticipated the dreams that followed the arrival of the newspaper. By long-continued experiment on the part of himself and his friends this conclusion was corroborated. In systematic hard thinking we remember events in their right order and our thoughts follow the lines of association traced in the brain. In dreams there is free association of images, often in no coherent order, and the dreamer is able to draw upon future as well as on past. But it is the dream-future. One can never "spot the Derby winner." If this conclusion stands, an enormous mass of evidence for telepathy is side-tracked at once. The person who appears in a dream shortly before his death is a dream memory of the news that the dreamer is about to receive. Clearly, too, Mr. Dunne's theory affects our view of psychic phenomena of all kinds, occurring at times when the waking consciousness has been stilled though actual sleep has not supervened.

Probably most of us can test the theory for ourselves. Here are two pieces of personal experience. Because the man who relates his dreams is voted a nuisance, I have asked the editor to let me be anonymous. Twice recently I have dreamed of something that appeared in the next day's paper. In one case I was in Berlin, trying to escape from a falling factory chimney. Next morning I paused at the bookstall and after some hesitation bought the one paper that contained a picture of a Berlin factory chimney being felled. I concluded that here was an example

of telepathy. The emotions generated in the printing office had somehow communicated themselves to me. But Mr. Dunne's theory is much

simpler.

This is trivial. The next example goes deeper. Everyone has experiences of an occasional flash of something valuable in a dream, but generally the results of the unco-ordinated free association of images found in dreams are quite useless. Recently I had to write an essay involving theological research during a time of great pressure. It has now been published, and some have said that it is a real advance in the study of the problem. But I could never have written it had I not had a succession of dreams which gave me nearly all the happy combinations and new insights—if they deserve to be so called. I jotted them down on waking and, contrary to one's usual experience, they were of real value. I am convinced that in them I am anticipating the line that at least some theological thought of the future will take. I have recently read a book, published after my essay, which works out far more thoroughly one of my main theses. We speak vaguely of ideas being "in the air," or of telepathy. Mr. Dunne's book suggests the startling simplification that in dreams, or in sudden waking flashes when the dream-consciousness takes possession, we may be drawing upon our future dreams suggested by books as yet unwritten. Think of the bearing of such a line of thought upon our theory of inspiration!

The philosophical part of Mr. Dunne's book is difficult for the untrained

reader to follow. The practical outcome is, I think, this.

In the statement "I am I," the first I is the subject, the second the object. (This is clear in French—Je suis moi.) But there is an ultimate observer who thinks the sentence, making a kind of fundamental trinity in human personality. In waking consciousness that observer is limited by the brain and the space-time realm in which he lives. In a dream the observer is in a measure detached from his experience, which he criticizes and interprets, often conscious that he is dreaming. The confusion and bewilderment of the dream is caused by his interpreting it in terms of the space-time experience of his waking life. Moreover—and this seems the most important conclusion—in his dreams the observer is not tied down to the associations formed in his brain by past experience, but transcends the limits fixed by the physical configurations of the brain. The dream-life is a continuum, in which the barrier that shuts off from us the future in our waking life may be removed.

Though he is not concerned with theology, Mr. Dunne throws out two suggestions of extreme interest to religious people. He vindicates the existence of the soul as against those who discredit the idea by pointing to its lowly origin—the dreams of primitive man, who fancied that his soul left the body in sleep. Primitive man, broadly speaking, was right. And he suggests that in sleep we are preparing for our life after death, when at the outset we shall be in a realm other than that of our space-time experience, which nevertheless will have to be interpreted in terms

of that experience.

We shall be "like unto them that dream" is our final comment on a remarkable book. At first we shall need to grow accustomed to the new conditions just as a new-born babe has to adjust himself to space-time existence. But it is hard to imagine that we shall ever reach a coherent consciousness without something corresponding to the limitations set on earthly consciousness by the brain—without, in short, the resurrection of

the body. If the conclusions of psychical research should come to be generally accepted, would they prove more than that we were tapping a kind of dream-consciousness of departed spirits, persons talking in their sleep?

X. Y.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEWS

I. (d).—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD AS DETERMINING THE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

The very valuable report of the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 to deal with the Christian doctrine of God fittingly concludes with a section on the nature of the worship to which that doctrine points. That for religion is the natural and necessary culmination of any and every doctrine of God. Man may want to know other things through a motive of intellectual curiosity, as Aristotle justly recognized. But he wants to know God as the ineffable and only perfect satisfaction of his own total being. And his instinctive reaction to that

knowledge is worship.

But worship shares to a notable extent in the paradoxical character of every form of the experience we call religious. It is not only a reaction to something known, but a divination also of something to be more fully known. It is the divination that the ultimately True and the ultimately Good can never be reached by any effort of man which is exclusively his own, that they must make themselves known to him, place themselves freely within his grasp. Hence the refusal of the characteristically religious experience to be satisfied with any truth or any goodness which is not felt as given. Revelation and grace are the two necessary forms of the divination of God. Worship begins when the Supreme Goodness and the Perfect Truth present themselves to us as attainable, but attainable only because they have already given themselves to us. Seeking, we learn we have already found, and found because the object of our search was already with us inspiring us to seek. And worship is the spiritual atmosphere in which alone the Great Discovery can be made.

All this, I presume, the Report takes for granted. Its concern is rightly with the conditions under which worship assumes formal expression of an ever more adequate and worthy kind, and especially how it is determined by the distinctively Christian Revelation. This task it has discharged with admirable simplicity and clearness, and with a general sufficiency for those who are already believers or rather for believers of the specifically Anglican type. The Report is a valuable instruction on the methods of worship which may be counted legitimate for those who have learned to accept the Christian Revelation in an Anglican milieu. It could not well have attempted more without danger of expanding into a vague excursus on the nature of worship which might have led far away

from the task in hand.

Yet is this enough in the actual position of today? For that position is determined by the fact that the effective Christian community is small and is probably growing smaller and smaller. By the effective Christian community I mean those who are bound together by a confident and well-grounded belief in the finality of traditional Christian doctrine as a Divine

Revelation. The Report evidently and quite justly holds that true worship depends upon a right apprehension of the true nature of God, and that that nature has been actually revealed in certain facts of history—viz., the life of Jesus Christ and of His Church. But the problem of worship is not quite so simple as all that. The Christian Church has been accustomed to regard worship not only as the spontaneous expression of right belief, but also as a conventional symbolism which may help to create the right belief. We cannot forget Pascal's prescription for those who, unfortunately, do not believe. "Do as believers do. Sprinkle yourself with holy water, sign yourself with the Cross, etc., that you too may come to believe." The naïve comedy may not commend itself to English Christians, but it is none the less true that that is one way in which belief of a kind in the Christian Revelation has been induced. Self-hypnosis, and a certain kind of worship is but a form of self-hypnosis, is a method of evoking and fostering belief on which every really popular religion relies

in greater or less degree.

But let it be granted that worship in every higher and worthier degree is the intelligent expression of a belief already fully possessed, that true Christian worship is an expression of full belief in the Christian Revelation. In that case, worship will be more or less paralyzed by every hesitation as to the exact import of the Revelation. And from that paralysis worship is in greater or less measure everywhere suffering today. The Christian religion is everywhere engaged either in restating the content of its Revelation or in affirming that no such restatement is for a single moment admissible. Where it adopts the latter attitude, as in countries of the Roman obedience or in Fundamentalist Protestantism, the area of worship shrinks just in proportion to shrinkage in the area of traditional belief. And here the area of belief is shrinking just because of the very intensiveness of its occupation by the believer. M. Paul Valéry, discussing recently what he calls "the problem of the priest" (which he defines more accurately as "the problem of the professional believer"), remarks that the believer's sincerity or intelligence is always suspect for the unbeliever. "It is almost inconceivable to the unbeliever," he continues, "that a man of education, calmly attentive to fact, capable of abstracting from vague personal desires and fears, can fail to reject as legends and fables all those bizarre and improbable stories which are essential to the authority of every religion, that he can overlook the fragility of the evidence and reasoning on which dogmas are founded, and show no sign of astonishment when revelations, i.e. announcements of a literally infinite importance for man, are presented to him in the form of dangerous riddles after the manner of the Sphinx." For himself, M. Valéry has solved the problem of the believer who is at once sincere and highly intelligent out of his own experience. Such a one is possible because M. Valéry has met him and that not infrequently. But he admits that he cannot understand this undoubted fact, the fact that faith of the kind he has described can and does co-exist with the highest intelligence. That failure to understand is not a merely personal idiosyncrasy on the part of M. Valéry. It is the measure of the unapproachableness of two contemporary types of mind, and further the measure in which the one type actually in our day creates the other. The tragedy of our time is that the believer, the more sincerely and determinedly he is a believer, calls the unbeliever into being.

It is the intractableness of that situation which the bishops of the Anglican Communion seem anxious to alleviate. They trace, for instance,

many of those imperfect conceptions of God whose existence within the Church they admit and deplore to an excessive and "mistaken" reverence for the Old Testament. They openly acknowledge a breach with the immemorial tradition of Christendom as to the equal revelational value of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. They further acknowledge or rather proclaim that that breach is the result of critical studies which are hardly more than a century old. All this is an immense concession to an attitude which not much more than a generation ago was denounced as leading inevitably to the destruction of the Christian faith. Now that purely critical attitude is applauded as having rescued the faith from its own immemorial blindness. But how is this renovation of the faith going to affect worship? In all the churches of the Anglican Communion the Old and New Testament lessons will be read as before, twice every Sunday, in the ears of the worshipping people. They will be read and heard as the Word of God, the Old Testament announcing through its miracles and prophecy the coming message of the New, the New relying for its credibility upon the Divine provision of that miraculous and prophetic guarantee of its truth. Then will come the "preaching of the Word" which will still be included "naturally" in the "form of such worship." And one of two things will happen. Either the sermon will follow the lines of the traditional theology, and then the imperfect conceptions of the Divine Nature will remain undisturbed. Or it will put the Old Testament in its place, with not very desirable effects upon the sincerity of the act of worship.

It is rapidly becoming a commonplace of the more facile and optimistic type of Christian apologetic that the positions into which modern science has been forced by its own recent discoveries are distinctly favourable to religion. They are indeed sometimes hailed as a kind of modern præparatio evangelica. What is true is that many of the scientists themselves acknowledge and even openly proclaim an attitude to life which they call religious, and which they believe to be religious just because it is accompanied by a kind of almost supernatural awe in the presence of Nature. Such awe is indeed of the very essence of worship considered as what I have called a divination. But what it seems for the most part to divine as an object of worship is something very remote from the Christian conception of God, whether in its traditional or its more modernized form. But further, there is another type of scientist on whom Nature makes no impression of this kind, who indeed takes refuge from the heartless indifference of Nature in something worshipful in man himself. This type draws nearer, it is true, to the distinctively Christian Revelation in that it usually finds in Jesus the pattern of what it holds worshipful in man. But its religion is in the end a Humanism more menacing to traditional Christianity than the other by reason of its greater momentary attractiveness. It is the modern Marcianism which worships the Redeemer God and execrates or ignores the creator god.

Traditional Christian worship as the expression of a definite traditional faith is something different in kind from this worship which seeks its object. Yet worship in specie Christiana is today being forced back to feel and acknowledge its dependence upon worship in genere. The faith of Christendom is more hesitant, the object of its faith less clear. And so the element of divination in its worship is once more emerging as in those first days when Christian worship gradually divined, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet how great the difference

between then and now! Then faith and worship rushed forward eagerly hand in hand to track down their common object, to enclose it in a net of sufficient concepts, of expressive phrases. Now worship is an ancient loyalty partially paralyzed by new and doubtful ventures of faith, or a doubtful and hesitant prophecy reproved by the majestic certainties of the past. It is suffering in both its aspects of divination and expression.

The bishops at Lambeth have reminded us once more of the nature of Christian worship as an expression of the Christian faith in God. They have briefly, but sufficiently, defined the true character of prayer, and as briefly traced the development from it of corporate Christian worship culminating in the Eucharist. They have added two mild criticisms of tendencies in contemporary worship which they consider to be dangerous, and they have concluded their treatment of the subject with an admirable last paragraph which to the present writer at least seems to indicate how little dangerous those tendencies are. "The heart and core of devotion is the immediate response upon the part of the worshippers to the love of Christ anticipating their thoughts and needs. Such elemental religion is not discoverable in the formally orthodox devotions of those who lack the intimate sense of Christ's abiding Presence. It may be discovered sometimes in forms and modes of worship which when strictly scrutinized may seem to lead away from the truest doctrine of God." Those are golden words, and deserve to be pondered at a time when worship is in much less danger from any excesses of its own, however regrettable, than from the general irresoluteness, confusion, dispersiveness of the faith on which it depends. samples problem Hallis over quotting et i radi vitag

III.—THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

due and all all all principles are an afficient. ${f A}$

sidesperiel elements of a conservable decear over the get book

It was the fate of the Near East to be harassed by war and catastrophe without respite for fourteen years from 1909 to 1923. The Turko-Italian War was followed by the troubles in Montenegro, and the two disastrous Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913 were scarcely over before the Great War broke out. The last act of the tragic period was consummated in the sack of Smyrna in 1923 and the rout of the Greeks by the Turks.

Deportations of large populations, the misery and want which follow in the wake of ruthless warfare, political and economic chaos consequent upon the redistribution of territory and the making of new states by the stroke of a pen, have shaken Eastern Europe and Asia Minor to their foundations. Out of hideous suffering there is emerging, slowly and painfully, a new world. The travail of the peoples is poignantly reflected in the lives of the students. Through the darkest days between 1920 and 1925 the men and women who in normal times would be preparing themselves in colleges and universities to be the future leaders of their respective countries were searching, with death dogging their footsteps, for the next meal and a covering from the cold. Greeks, Bulgarians, Yugo-Slavs, Russians, Armenians, Turks, their customary hatreds starved out of them, were drawn together by common suffering and common gratitude to fellow-students in other less fortunate countries and to the League of Nations for relief of that suffering. And the grip of that harrowing discipline has roused in South-Eastern Europe desires for peace, education, spiritual freedom, and social righteousness. The nations which are newly born or are discovering themselves afresh are naturally looking for guidance to those institutions in Western Europe which seem

to them stable and alive.

As the new Turkey is looking to France as a model for her political ideals and institutions, so the Orthodox Churches, face to face with the task of adjusting their traditional faith and practice to utterly changed conditions in the Near East, are turning to England and the English Church, hoping to find friendly aid from fellow-Christians who are themselves sensitive to new movements of thought and in close touch with the seething perplexities of the modern world.

It is the promise of real union with the Orthodox Church which is the outstanding feature of the Report on the Unity of the Church accepted by

the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

It is true that the Conference is able to record "an attempt at a rapprochement des cœurs as between the Roman Catholic Church and ourselves," but the Pope, apparently anxious over the increasing friendship between Orthodox and Anglicans, by disowning in the Encyclical Mortalium animos (1928) any scheme for union that was not based on complete submission to the Holy See, and sharply distinguishing between Orthodox Orders as valid and Anglican as not, has effectually discouraged the desire of many Roman Catholics to study reunion problems in a fair and scientific spirit.

It is true, on the other side, that the South India proposals and the attitude of Lambeth towards them represent the furthest point of progress yet reached in the long journey towards reunion with Presbyterians,

Methodists, and Congregationalists.

But had he lived to read the results of Lambeth 1930 Archbishop Davidson would have found a glorious confirmation of the words which he addressed to the Convocation of Canterbury in 1923: "Among all the gleams of hope which are struggling into steadier light, none is vaster in its possibilities than are the questions which belong to our relations to

the ancient Christian Churches of the East."

Contact between the Orthodox and the Anglican Church goes back to the time of the Greek Patriarch Cyril Lucar, who recognized the affinity between the principles of the two Churches and presented Charles I. with the famous Codex Alexandrinus. More than one Orthodox priest studied at Balliol during the seventeenth century, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to send others regularly to Oxford. Important negotiations were carried on between the Non-jurors and the Greek Patriarchs in the early years of the eighteenth century.

William Palmer of Magdalen was sent by the leaders of the Oxford Movement to make friends with the Russian Church authorities, and his Harmony of the Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Eastern Church,

published in 1846, helped to remove misunderstandings.

The question of intercommunion was first taken up by Convocation in 1863, and in the next year was founded the Society now known as the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, which has laboured so

thoroughly and so patiently for rapprochement.

The Eastern, Anglican, and Old Catholic Churches joined in a Conference at Bonn in 1874. And successive Lambeth Conferences since 1897 have given attention to our relations with the East. For the last sixty years distinguished Anglicans such as Christopher and John Wordsworth,

Collins, and Birkbeck have devoted their learning and energy to preparing the way for closer union. This personal work was consummated in the labours of Randall Davidson extending from the time that he became chaplain to Archbishop Tait in 1877 until the day of his death.

All this preparatory work took the form of—

1. Removal of ignorance and misunderstanding by mutual study.

2. Visits for intercourse and the strengthening of friendship.

3. Sympathetic prohibition of proselytizing as exemplified by the policy of Bishop Blyth in Jerusalem.

4. Hospitality to Serbian students and ordinands during the war, and assistance to the Œcumenical Patriarchate in securing the rights of

Christians in the years following the war.

5. Friendly discussion of practical questions arising out of the presence of Orthodox Christians in the United States and the British Empire and their desire to make use of the opportunities afforded by the Anglican Church where no Orthodox priest was available.

The fruits of all this preparatory work were ripened by friendships made and experiences shared during the war, and have been abundant

during the last ten years.

In spite of the temptation to let secondary motives intrude upon the magnetic influences of the Holy Spirit—and it would be foolish to overlook the pressure of the temptation to seek the political assistance of Britain in maintaining ancient rights in the Near East, or of the lure of an anti-Roman Catholic combination, or of the dream of a merely defensive alliance between two great Communions against the anti-religious forces of the modern world—real advance has been made.

1. A Greek professor who attended the Lambeth Conference of 1920 wrote in a Greek periodical: "There is a reason which more urgently disposes people of our race, our Orthodox Church, to turn eager eyes towards the Church of England and those who profess its faith. This reason is the exceptionally friendly attitude of that Church towards ours and the exceptional good feeling of the chivalrous English nation towards

Greeks in general. between the first and and the their "This feeling cannot but find an echo in our sensitive and grateful spirit, and dispose us towards everything English, and cannot but strengthen and increase our desire for religious and ecclesiastical union

with them."

whene its ball transfer thospions and a private initiality 2. Deeper than any mere anti-Latin prejudice there has been discovered a fundamental likeness of theological temper in a distrust of innovations on the Faith and Order of the early centuries. Most Anglicans would heartily accede to the Orthodox position as described by Birkbeck. "She does not allow that because certain dogmas held from the beginning seemed to this or that school to lead by a logical process to fresh dogmas, and because the advocates of this new inference may seem able to maintain their arguments against all opponents, the Church has the right to make a new dogma and to force the result of their syllogistic deductions upon the faithful as an article of Faith."*

3. Anglicans have learnt to understand that the Orthodox Church combines an unyielding adherence to the principles of the undivided Church of the first nine centuries with an attitude of toleration and practical charity towards those who disagree with her. This liberal spirit is made

^{*} Birkbeck and the Russian Church, p. 94.

WORKING THE THEFT WILL IN ACCOUNT

possible by the principle of economy, a technical term in Orthodox theology meaning that the Church has power to use her discretion as long as she does not, in using it, controvert the fundamental grounds of Faith.

4. The minds of Orthodox theologians have been, if not entirely satisfied upon, at least sympathetically disposed towards, Anglican teaching as to the number of the Sacraments, the Eucharist, Confession, Ordination and the authority of the General Councils.

Besides this rich growth of mutual understanding significant events

have taken place during the last ten years.

1. In 1922 a permanent representative of the Eastern Church took

up his residence in this country.

2. On July 22, 1922, the Holy Synod of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople declared the validity of Anglican Orders. This was followed by a similar declaration by the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Cyprus. The other nine patriarchates have not yet followed their example.

3. In 1925 official representatives of almost all the Orthodox Churches joined with Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion in services held at Westminster and St. David's commemorating the sixteenth

centenary of the Council of Nices. The Council of Nices.

4. In the same year the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius was inaugurated with the aim of bringing the younger generation of English

and Russian Christians into closer understanding.

This year's Lambeth Conference was attended by "the most weighty delegation ever sent by the Orthodox Church to any Western Church," and "the Orthodox Church has been willing to proceed from a general exchange of views to definite negotiations." To this end a Doctrinal Commission is to be set up, "which may, in correspondence and consultation, prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there is difference and agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches."

It is from no lack of sympathy or interest that the Russian Church was unable to share in the Conference, and it is to be fervently hoped that she may soon be free to share with her sister Churches the rich new life which will surely rise out of the fires of persecution.

The movement towards full intercommunion between the Anglican

and Eastern Churches is full of hope for the future.

1. On general grounds all unification of Christian life and effort is to

be welcomed because "God wills fellowship."

2. The Orthodox Churches are said to number at least 120 million adherents, and if the Churches of our Communion enter into full organic union with them, the day will be hastened, to which our Bishops look forward, when "the racial and historical connections which at present characterize the Anglican Communion will be transcended and its life merged in a larger fellowship in the Catholic Church." Most English Christians have almost everything to learn about the oneness of the life of a national and regional Church with the larger life of the Church Universal.

A missionary, in training African girls in the sense of membership of the great Tribe which knows no frontiers in this world or the next, says to her girls: "You may expect to recognize another member of the tribe whatever his race or colour or language by his likeness to the Chief." That thought of the world-wide oneness of Church-people in Christ is very precious to the Orthodox Churches, and they have ever striven to

keep it alive. It is but a part of a priceless spiritual heritage, as yet

little understood by the West, which they desire to share with us.

3. Again, it is probably only through the patient co-operation of Orthodox and Anglicans that reconciliation will be effected with the separated Churches of the East, either among themselves or with any larger reunited fellowship. Our approach to these Churches should probably in future be made through joint action with representatives of Orthodoxy, and it is greatly to be hoped that no time will be lost in working to that end.

The dangers and difficulties associated with this, as with any other

great forward movement, it would be foolish to overlook.

For long centuries nearly all the Orthodox and Separated Churches, with the exception of Russia, have been accustomed for longer or shorter periods to exist as melets in the midst of either Zoroastrian or Islamic communities.

"A melet is the technical term in Turkey for a Christian subject-nation, organized as they always are in a Church, and dealing with the government through its religious Head."* But the melet plan is much older than the Turkish domination of the Near East. The book of Esther shows the Jews living as a melet among the Persians. Julius Cæsar made use of the melet idea in his treatment of the Jews in the Roman Empire. The system in the hands of the Neo-Persians proved an extraordinarily effective instrument in checking the vitality of the Asiatic Church in the early Christian centuries, and in preventing its contact with the branches of the Church which lay West of it. The ruler was accustomed to demand some recognizable head of the Church with whom and through whom he could negotiate, and this head must if possible be a persona grata to himself, and not too fond of independence. His appointment must at least be approved by the ruling state. He must not acquire the habit of appealing to the heads of other Churches for counsel or help for fear "The melet system guarantees of awkward extra-national complications. the existence of, and gives some freedom to, the Church of a subject population; but it also puts a premium on that spirit of quarrel and intrigue which is the bane of Eastern Christianity."†

It is as the Eastern Churches have been able to throw off the yoke of this subtle form of domination that they have become able to entertain hopes of union with Churches with quite other historical and political associations. But the fact that the Orthodox Churches have for centuries been subject to peculiar and often cruel disabilities of melet government means that none of these Churches with the exception of Russia have been able to develop the missionary aspect of the Church's life and witness without which there is such grievous loss of vitality. The system is, moreover, bound to sap moral initiative and to extol mere survival. Churchmanship is bound to be entangled with a bitter and

aggrieved nationalism.

Age-long political circumstances have thus tended to ingrain habits of life and thought in Eastern Christendom which are absolutely alien both from its own essential genius and from those of the Anglican Communion. It will take the Eastern Churches time to enter into the fulness of their heritage of spiritual freedom.

The vast majority of their clergy and laity do not care about reunion

† Wigram, op. cit., p. 97.

^{*} Wigram, The Assyrian Church, p. 31.

and are content to remain as they are. And of the few who desire closer unity with other Churches, those who look to Rome are probably as

numerous as those who look to Canterbury.

Again, though the Russian Church is faced with an ordeal more cruel and searching than that through which we threw off the shackles of mediæval papalism, the rest of the Orthodox Churches have never passed through anything corresponding to our Reformation. This fact undoubtedly makes any thought of reunion between Anglican and Orthodox repugnant to many if not most Free Churchmen of the English-speaking world. This repugnance must be respected, for it would be grievous to win reunion with the East at the cost of serious alienation of our fellow-Christians of the Free Churches.

Everything must be done to remove the impression, which party strife only aggravates, that Anglicanism is nothing but a patchwork of ill-blended colours. Never have the essential and distinctive features of the unique trust committed to the Anglican Communion been so clearly or persuasively declared as in the 1930 Lambeth Report. These principles must be commended to all Christians outside the Anglican fold, and nothing will achieve this so effectively as their loyal acceptance by

Anglicans of all shades of thought.

Further, we must be quite honest with our Orthodox friends in making plain that we believe that "the comprehension of divine truth can only be reached under conditions of free experiment in thinking," and that "the truths unveiled by science, by history, by critical investigation,

by thought, will only illumine and enrich the Faith."*

It is the immediate duty of our Church to help and supplement the work of the forthcoming Doctrinal Commission by urging upon clergy and laity the need to study the thought and practice of the Orthodox Church, by encouraging the intercourse between the younger people of the two Churches, and by trying to create a nucleus on both sides who

are really prepared to become experts.

The World's Student Christian Federation, the Y.M.C.A., and the Y.W.C.A. have already done admirable work in bringing together Catholics, Orthodox, and Protestants in the Near East, and several Orthodox students have spent some time in British colleges. Scholarships which would enable British students to travel in the Near East and Orthodox students to spend a year with an Anglican Community or theological college would be a practical response to the lead given by the Lambeth Conference.

The Old Catholics‡ owe their existence as an organized body to those members of the Roman Communion who sympathized with Döllinger in opposing the Vatican Decree of 1870 which made the Infallibility of the Pope an article of Faith. They threw in their lot with a Church in Holland which had developed in 1723 as the result of the Pope's condemnation of Jansenism, and have taken their stand on the rejection of the whole tendency towards papalism and "development" in dogma, and the acceptance of a position, clearly outlined in the Declaration of

* Milner-White and Knox, One God and Father of all, pp. 16, 19.

[†] Kidd, The Churches of Eastern Christendom; J. A. Douglas, The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox; Gavin, Greek Orthodox Thought; Zankov, The Eastern Orthodox Church; and Wand, History of the Modern Church, chapters xix. and xxi., would form a good introduction to the subject.

† See The Old Catholic Churches and Reunion, by C. B. Moss. S.P.C.K.

Utrecht (1889), which is virtually identical with that of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Old Catholicism is defined in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics as "the modern revival of Catholicism as it was understood in the first centuries," and its aims are described as (a) theological reform, (b) ecclesiastical reform, (c) union of the Christian Churches.

The movement is strongest in Holland, but there are parishes in

Switzerland and some activity in other European countries.

There have been "friendly relations" between Old Catholics and Anglicans for many years, and as long ago as 1889 they were examining the validity of our Orders. In 1892 John Wordsworth on the invitation of the General Assembly of the Old Catholic Church in Holland wrote a letter to that Church on the succession of Bishops in England and the sufficiency of the Anglican Rite of Ordination; but it was only in 1925 that our Orders were publicly declared to be valid, and the fervent hope expressed "of a future more intimate and powerful contact with the Church of England and her daughter Churches on a truly Catholic basis."

The result of this has been full consultation during the recent Lambeth Conference with the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer, and a decision to appoint a joint Doctrinal Commission.

If and when full intercommunion is reached it may be possible to start a plan whereby Anglican chaplains will not be appointed in places where there are Old Catholic churches. The Old Catholics might be invited to supply priests for some of our Churches on the Continent. In any case, Anglican chaplains in Europe might be encouraged to do some liaison work with other sympathetic Communions with a view to curing English residents and travellers abroad of their insularity and enlisting their interest in a wider Catholic Fellowship.

Possibilities of reunion with Scottish Presbyterianism are likely to be more fully discussed again now that the happy union of the established Church and the United Free Church is a fait accompli. The avenues to reunion with the Evangelical Free Churches have during the last ten years been very thoroughly explored, and the principles at stake brought

to a practical test in the South India Proposals.

These proposals have received so much attention during the last year that it is not necessary to go over them in detail. Suffice it to say that they seemed to lead earnest groups of Christians whose sympathies inclined this way or that to a serious impasse. It was the impasse created by the conflict between loyalty to the traditional Faith and Order of the historic Church, and belief in the contemporary inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Obviously this loyalty and this faith cannot ultimately contradict

each other if God is really and continuously at work in history.

What the South Indian Christians who propose to unite are asking is to be allowed to discover for themselves that their present faith will lead them to essential Catholic loyalties. They are content to make for themselves the venture of apprehending that for which they believe God is apprehending them.

There is a method of education which lays stress on the self-evident truth that we learn by discovery, and that in a sense we cannot make truth our own till we have discovered or re-discovered it for ourselves.

This is an excellent method, but it may overlook the existence of an accumulated store of knowledge which is available without retracing

all the steps by which it has been attained; and the road of discovery may be marked by blunders as well as successes. If the child puts himself into the shoes of the discoverer, the parent or the elder brother does well

to stand by in case of a tumble.

The South Indian Christians have no desire to deny any truth of the Christian Faith or to incur the charge of schism by breaking away from any group of Christians to which they have been attached by sacred loyalties; but they desire to be free to learn by discovering for themselves. This is the only possible way to go to work in the circumstances which obtain in South India at the present time, and they are well aware that they may make blunders and waste time and energy. But they are prepared to take the risk, and do not ask any other Church or group of Christians to involve themselves in any mistakes which they may make. They asked the Lambeth Conference to act in loco parentis and stand by in order to minimize futility of effort or wrong action by wise counsel, and they are content to leave the future in the hands of God.

The Bishops at Lambeth have given the advice asked of them. It was in effect their duty to try to define what were to be taken as the essentials of Catholic Faith and Order in relation to the proposed scheme, and what could be dealt with on the principle of economy. They have discharged the first part of their task by reiterating the four points commonly known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral—the Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, and the Historic Episcopate; by explaining at length what is meant by the Historic Episcopate; and by making it clear that intercommunion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union

(Lambeth Report, pp. 114-17).

In regard to the many and difficult adjustments that will have to be made in the process of union the principle of economy has been generously applied, but whatever misgivings some may have, it would be unfair to contend that any fundamental principle of Faith and Order has been

ignored or controverted.

There will be some Anglicans, priests and laity, who will find themselves eager to join in this bold experiment if it goes forward; there will be others conscientiously unable to do so. There will be some eager to support the future United Church with their alms; there will be others

who prefer to give their alms to other missionary work.

This way in thouse of considerate and and

It will be disastrous if the giving or withholding of personal service or alms becomes governed by the machinery of party concord. By all means let us mutually respect our personal convictions, but let us not spoil an adventure in which the guidance of the Holy Spirit is plainly evident by passing judgment by our words or actions before the experiment has been completed.

E. R. Morgan.

I deliver many testers were set to a Brosoftile a material to the interest

would be that this things on plotty was plotty was should be able to able to proper

It is now understood by Christian people everywhere that the Anglican Communion is actively committed to the cause of Christian reunion, and is taking a leading part in the attempt to bring into an adequately organic relation the various separated bodies. The deliberations of the Lambeth Conference upon the subject of the unity of the Church have aroused widespread interest, for the reunion of Christendom is, in fact, the supreme

need of the modern world, and in the pursuit of that end the Church recovers such colour and romance as draw the eyes of men. The findings of the Conference are not presented in the most easily digestible form, since they must be sought in the lengthy report of the sub-committee, in the Encyclical Letter, and in a series of resolutions, and what is stated in one place may be found modified in another; but certain features take

clear shape at the outset.

The bishops are profoundly convinced that the reunion of the Church is the will of God for this time, and the reasons given for their approach to the task are balanced and weighty—reasons soundly Catholic and soundly evangelical. They are likewise conscious of a peculiar responsibility resting upon the Anglican Communion, due to its inclusion, within one ecclesiastical organization, of the traditional Faith and Order of the Catholic Church, and the recognition of the immediacy of man's approach to God to which the Evangelical bodies bear witness, together with a wide freedom of intellectual enquiry. But there follows from this a deduction which appears to have been accepted without demur. It is assumed that if it be granted that our Church has a signal, and indeed a central, service to perform in the reconstruction of Christendom, it must at this time be such as the bishops suppose. I beg to suggest that this

is a non seguitur.

Upon a broad view of history it certainly appears that in the providence of God the English Church has been chosen, and is being prepared, for some specific contribution to the task of welding together the scattered elements of the whole Respublica Christiana. It is one thing, however, to believe this, and quite another thing to assume that our Church is at present ready to prosecute so advanced a stage of the labour as the bishops are attempting. The problem we all know. It is to correlate and incorporate with the Catholicism of East and West those multitudinous particular emphases which have appeared in Protestantism, each long embedded in its own body of organization and psychological habit. The problem is in itself enormous, but our faith must not flinch before it. And, indeed, we should have good reason to believe it practically soluble could it be shown that such correlation and integration were already, upon however circumscribed a field, fruitfully consummated. The subcommittee's report seems to suggest that the Anglican Communion is entitled to take such ground, but this is a large assumption. The divisions and conflicts within the English Church are known to the world at large. It would be natural enough that, given a Church comprising the emphatic expression of both Catholic and Evangelical values, Catholics and Evangelicals beyond its borders should be attracted by the survival within it of those values which they most prized. It might well be possible to convince them of the actuality of the living co-ordination of those values within that Church. But one essential condition in such a procedure would be that this Church, so richly complex, should be able to present to a divided Christendom a philosophy of its own unity upon which its own members were generally agreed.

Now, the Church of England, the whole Anglican Communion, is constantly embarrassed in the discussion of reunion by the fact that there is no agreed conception of what actually constitutes the Anglican unity, of the true relation of its several components, or even of what is rightfully included within it. This embarrassment appears between the lines of every relevant page of the record of the Lambeth proceedings.

The working-out of policy becomes too complicated even for the most astute minds; for not only have the bishops to address themselves to the widely sundered Churches of the world, but they have always to consider the effect of every word upon the parties of their own Church. There is no cause for wonder if they sometimes lapse into a verbal ingenuity which may save them from an immediate pressure, but can provide no foothold for true advance. With the utmost respect for the sincerity and the charity of the bishops, and with no small measure of admiration for the sheer ability here displayed, one may yet conclude that their findings

have presented their Church with a series of perplexities.

Let it be admitted that, for the prospect of a genuine correlation of the Christian witness in the world, a period of some vagueness in which methods "bold and new" should be adopted, and various applications of the principle of "economy" made, would have to be endured. It must, nevertheless, be doubted whether we have been granted a prospect of sufficient magnitude or certainty to compensate for the measure of "economy" already involved. The margin of vagueness has been expanded in the perpetual fear of the repercussions which definite and final decisions would produce within the Anglican Communion, which, while inviting the world to reunion, has not accomplished its own integration. In short, the bishops have not yet grappled with the governing intractability of their own situation.

It is necessary, in a brief survey, to adhere to fundamental considerations, and we must content ourselves with illustrating our thesis from the record of the proceedings. Both theoretic statements and practical proposals give evidence of the embarrassment of which we have spoken. In theoretic statement, this is specially obvious in the various references to the Church and the Ministry. The sub-committee's report admits, as it was bound to admit, the existence of the full conception of Order and

Sacrament in our Church:

"In the experience of many of us this heritage of Faith and Order seems to be one and indivisible, and to have its roots in the redemptive method of God in the Incarnation. To those who share that view the historic order and the prominence of sacramental worship which commonly accompanies it stand for and bear constant witness to the God-given element in the Christian life, which is prior to and independent of all subjective feeling on our part."

Now, we may believe it ultimately possible to show that this view does not conflict with what evangelical Protestants believe about the immediacy of the soul's access to God. What is entirely impossible is to show that there is nothing contradictory between the Catholic and the Evangelical Protestant views of the place of the Episcopate in the

Church:

The bishops appear to think that they have removed the objections to the formula, "Episcopacy as a fact," by explaining that it was never intended to ask for the recognition of the "fact" apart from its traditional functions. They insist, rightly enough, that certain functions have always belonged to the bishop, and they hold that these must be maintained. At the same time, and while they give their own reasons for a most rigid claim for the retention of episcopacy as a condition of reunion, they "do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union." It is not easy to combine so rigid a claim for episcopacy with a

willingness to approve so great an elasticity of interpretation. But in the Catholic view, a particular interpretation is inseparable from the "fact," and although it may be possible to effect some sort of external union between Catholics and those who are prepared to accept the "fact" and the "functions," not one single step will have been taken toward the integration of the Catholic and Evangelical conceptions of the Church

and the ministry. and anager accounts and daily accounts and

Nor do we discover that the bishops envisage more than an extension of the present Anglican conflicts through a Church universal, united upon the acceptance of facts uninterpreted and functions unexplained. The sub-committee can satisfy the important Orthodox delegation that the English Church believes that Holy Orders is a mysterion, a sacrament, and in its succession a link with the Apostles. But they can also consider that the conclusions of the Lausanne Conference upon the subject of the Episcopate "implied a general recognition of the lines on which a common agreement might be attained." The Lausanne statement recited that in view of the facts that in the early Church the Episcopate, Councils of presbyters, and Congregations of the faithful had assigned functions, and that "episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational systems of government are each today, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom," and are "each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church," they must all "have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church."

Without prejudging the question of the value of the Councils of presbyters and the Congregations of the faithful, we may observe that in the great communions" of today their place is nothing comparable to their place in the early Church. They are not the same things. In the modern Protestant communions they have become supreme, and have discharged such functions of the Episcopate as have survived within those communions. Hence, in the Lausanne statement the Episcopate is equated with modern congregational and presbyterial systems of government and itself becomes of no more than experimental value; and the sacramental conception of Holy Orders does not appear upon the remotest horizon. If it be suggested that non-episcopal ministries may bear a sacramental interpretation, the reply is that no such interpretation is offered, or would be tolerated, in any Protestant communion. Nor is there the least likelihood that those bodies would accept an Episcopal ordination which openly professed to effect what the Orthodox delegation understood Holy Orders to be in the mind of the Anglican Com-

Manufacture of And Wes. Thank out assessments to large wild be wealthing: This confusion arises from a prior one. So long as you claim an ultimate value for the idea of the historic Church as one and continuous, necessarily offering visible pledges of its identity and continuity, it is impossible to treat the ecclesiastical preferences of all baptized persons as entitled to modify the idea of the Church, merely because those persons are baptized. The bishops at Lambeth clearly implied that it is baptism that brings a person into the Church. They did not undertake to say that every subsequently adopted opinion of baptized persons, or of groups of baptized persons, must be incorporated in the Church's life. It is not necessary to object to presbyterial and lay co-operation in Church government. But we must insist that nothing has yet been done to integrate the modern Presbyterian and Congregational with the historic Catholic principles. It will be found necessary to begin such integration

further back, in the notion of the very purpose of the Christian revelation,

and of "the redemptive method of God in the Incarnation."

This process is not yet adequately consummated in our own Communion, and there is a perpetual danger that any proposal for reunion will cause a fresh outbreak of Anglican party warfare. Thus the bishops' theoretic statements lay side by side principles which are as yet unreconciled within the Churches which they represent. It is not by such facile methods that the obstinate problems are to be solved. What they would produce, could they operate completely, would be a Church Universal which would be an Anglicanism more than ever piebald. What we need is a Church Universal composed of Christians all Catholic, all Evangelical, and all awake to the demands of truth. What we are in some danger of getting is a Church by no means Universal, consisting of dissonant groups who have accepted some sort of common organic tie. I do not regard the danger as very great, because I do not think that the Protestant bodies have any vivid regard for the cause of one visible Church. This is admitted in the Report, and their indifference arises from their fundamental

assumption concerning the nature of the Church.

There is an alternative prospect, however, which in the peculiar circumstances of South India is likely to be translated into accomplished fact. The proposals for union in South India, and the attitude of the Lambeth Conference toward them, have been widely and gravely discussed. It is impossible for me to enter here into this labyrinthine controversy. I propose only to point out the main bearings upon the scheme, and upon the bishops' commendation, of the thesis which we have tried to develop. The statement of what the proposals are expected eventually to effect is clearer than some of the proposals themselves. "There will emerge a Province of Christ's Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, within whose visible unity treasures of faith and order, nowhere in the Church at present combined, will be possessed in common." I trust I shall not be suspected of cynicism if I remark that since upon the foreign mission field certain evil consequences of division are forcibly presented, the desire for union there awakened may prove to be generated by less than the profoundest reasons. I mean that practical exigencies may outweigh other considerations and may force the pace. I would add, further, that in South India the possibility of the richest, deepest, and most difficult reunion is not tested. The Catholic view has not been strongly represented in the uniting parties. What this "truly Catholic" Province will amount to is about one-third of the Christians of South India, and those predominantly Protestant, or at any rate unsympathetic toward what the Roman or Eastern Churches would regard as Catholicism. One gathers that so far as the Anglicans in South India are concerned, further concessions to Protestant principles might not have been difficult to make, but Anglican opinion elsewhere had to be considered.

This, clearly, is no signal or promising example of any reunion that really matters. There has been achieved, in this instance, what is regarded as a measure of doctrinal agreement sufficient to warrant corporate union. But what has happened is that even here, where the uniting elements were comparatively closely akin to begin with, it has been found impossible to make of the united body an effectual link between its parent communions. Doctrinal agreement has been reached at the price of creating something very like a new denomination. In thirty years it may be yet more distinctly another denomination. That is a considera-

tion of more significance than the extraordinary "economy" which has

been found necessary for so small an achievement.

And this is reunion! It is a union which is due, in some measure, to the failure of our Church, so far, to accomplish its own integration of thought and witness. Lacking that, it cannot achieve corporate unity with Catholics or Protestants beyond its own borders, without risking further and more serious disintegration within its borders. That fear has actually affected the Lambeth attitude to South India, and the

situation now remaining is disquieting.

With all respect, I beg to suggest that the main contribution of the English Church to the cause of reunion, for years to come, must be made within its own communion. It is a contribution of capital significance, but it may never be made unless our leaders understand its real nature. The various references to the unity of the Church, in the Lambeth volume, occupy more than fifty pages, of which about twenty lines are devoted to the subject of unity amongst Anglicans. It seems that the time has come for a revision of this proportion.

W. J. PECK.

described the about the case of the state of the state of the case of the characters.

administrative particle and administration of an expension of an ambient attended to an amount

VI.—YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION

The subject of this brief review of part of the Report of the Lambeth Conference is the supply of men for Holy Orders, and the Church's duty to provide for it. It deals particularly with the important matters discussed in Section V.a of the Report (pp. 164 to 169). But the findings of the Committee on the Ministry of the Church cannot be understood apart from the excellent statements made by Committee number VI., on "Youth and its Vocation" (pp. 188 to 200). The special call to the priesthood is indeed the greatest, as we believe, which can come to a man, and I must confine myself almost entirely to that vocation. I ask my readers, however, to have in mind also the last thirteen pages of the

Lambeth Report.

And here I would venture on a criticism, pertinent to my subject, of the otherwise admirable findings of the Sixth Committee. Throughout their Report they write of an entity called "Youth" (with a capital Y), to which certain qualities can be assigned, and appeals of various kinds made. Young people who have read the Report (or that part of it) do not believe in any such abstraction. They say that notwithstanding the effects of the War, which are obvious enough, youth still shows varieties as infinite as ever; and that it is impossible to group the young together, even for study, without falling into such vague generalization as is useless for any practical purposes. Young people are clever or dull, adventurous or immobile, cynical or generous, poetic or prosaic, disciplined or unrestrained, as they always were. Even in the sphere of religion, in which "Youth" is generally supposed to display an unwelcome solidarity, it is as varied as ever. It is unhappily true that there are fewer young men and women in the churches than in past days. But it is equally true that many persons who, while they were young, came to church with great regularity have dropped off in later years; married life, or the competition of other interests, become too strong for the things of the spirit. I do not think that the proportion of young or middle-aged or old people in

church is any smaller than it was.

The variety of temperament which shows itself generally among young people is seen also in measure in the class of young men to whom we look for recruits for the Ministry of the Church. Some of them, no doubt, are modern in the sense referred to in the Lambeth Report; they are apt to defy authority and moral sanctions, and to repudiate principles which are essential to the welfare of society. But there are also many young men who are deeply interested in religion, particularly in prayer, who are responsive, interested in good causes, passionately desirous of social justice and international peace, whose humanity shows itself in acts of sacrifice and service. It is true that "all the world over they are taking a conscious and active part in the great movements of the time, to an extent which perhaps has never been equalled before" (p. 188). In short, if Mr. Bertrand Russell and Mr. Aldous Huxley have their disciples, so also have Toc H and the Student Christian Movement.

There are thus many varieties of modes of thought among young men today; but there are also other variations, of class and opportunity, which considerably affect the quality of Candidates for Ordination. There is still a great gulf fixed between the Public School man and other young Englishmen. The failure of certain well-meant attempts to combine these elements in Summer Camps, and by other means, displays the difficulty of mixing social classes. One of the outstanding problems of the Church of England is the placing of priests who come from one or

other of these divisions.

These, however, are merely illustrations of the wide diversity of character, temperament and education of modern young men. We must turn now to our main subject, to which these considerations are preliminary.

I. THE SITUATION TODAY

What are the means by which the English priesthood is now being recruited? Whence do the men for the most part come? How are they chosen? What are their outstanding characteristics? How far do the

numbers meet or fail to meet the demand for clergy?

There is a steady though small stream of older men seeking Ordination; probably more than in the past, owing to the realization that young men are not offering themselves, or not being accepted in sufficient numbers. I think it is true to say that the great majority of these older men are rejected, or so discouraged that they withdraw of themselves. It is not for me to discuss this fact further at the moment; our present concern is

with the young.

Of these, a certain proportion, probably a growing number, still come from the Public Schools. In my own work with Ordinands I see chiefly (though not exclusively by any means) those who need grants in aid of their training; and of these most candidates come rather from the schools where the sons of the poorer professional men are educated than from those to which the richer parents send their boys. It is difficult to be quite sure about this; but it looks as though, for instance, Christ's Hospital and some of the Woodard Schools provide more vocations than other very great and famous establishments. The whole question of the recruiting of the priesthood from the Public Schools needs close attention. I would suggest that the assistant masters have a great influence in the matter, and

have been little consulted; it would be an excellent step to approach

as many as posible, and to ask for their advice and help.

A very great number of Ordinands today come from the ranks of bank and other clerks, shopmen, mechanics, and an appreciable number of soldiers and sailors. In London we have a constant supply from the City. Probably the most important change since the War—indeed, during the last twenty-five years or more—has been the relative drying up of the stream of men from the better-off classes and the spreading of vocations over the whole community. This fact is deplored by some, who appear to think that no man can be a faithful priest unless he has first been what is conventionally called a gentleman; it is, indeed, excellent if our candidates can be such; but yet the change is a permanent one, and is a healthy symptom of the modern sympathies of the Church:

II. SOME SALIENT POINTS IN THE SITUATION

(a) It is undeniable that the entire supply of Ordination Candidates from all classes falls far short of the need. Figures are given on p. 166 of the Lambeth Report which show, in brief, that while 4,000 men have received Holy Orders since the War, even to have maintained our position we ought to have had in the same period 4,000 more. In 1919 there were 16,466 ordained men working in England (following Lambeth, I am confining myself to this country); in 1929 there were only 15,070. Nothing more need be said; the figures speak for themselves. We are nowhere near making up the deficiency even if we reckon in all the men who are now preparing for Ordination.

(b) On the whole, the standard of character among the men who seek Holy Orders improves. I have been during the last seven years in close touch with a great many, and have shared much responsibility in the selection of them. I have watched many through their period of training. There are disappointments, of course, and some losses, though these last are surprisingly few. The general type of personality and character shows a real advance. The laborious days spent by some of us interviewing prospective candidates is lightened by

the attractive boys and young men who come to see us.

(c) A large proportion of the men ordained today have to ask for grants towards the payment of their expenses. Very properly the bishops are requiring a higher standard of efficiency, both intellectual and devotional, than in the past; this necessitates a longer period of preparation. Many of the men who are called are in well-paid work, but have no private means, and often are in touch with no sources from which they can raise money. Very few of the clergy, for instance, whose sons still come forward in promising numbers, can afford the full expense of their boys' training during the long period up to twenty-three years of age; and many other parents are in a like position.

The really serious circumstance here is that still nothing like enough funds are forthcoming from the Church to train the men who undoubtedly have vocations. We are thus in a position to choose the best; but that is a poor consolation to set against the tragedy of the rejection of so many excellent young men who would make good and faithful, if not brilliant,

priests.

(d) One consequence of this lack of money stands out prominently. Very few of the corporations which make grants to Ordination Candidates

can afford to help them to matriculate. In most instances Committees simply cannot look at men or boys who have not already got so far as this. "Come again when you have matriculated" has become a sad formula to be used in rejecting delightful people, And how is a boy who has left school at sixteen, or even earlier, and is now twenty or twenty-one, to work himself up to the always stiffening Matriculation standard in the time left over from laborious days spent in an office or factory or on a farm, and without any means of getting help in his studies? Often he can hardly scrape together money to buy books. This is one of the fundamental problems before the Church of England. We need many Test Schools, where men and boys can try their vocations, and where they can be worked up to Matriculation standard. Knutsford is doing excellently; but the thing must be done on a far bigger scale if we are to cope with the need for priests in the years to come. I fully agree that these should be the responsibility of the Church as a whole, and not of any section; but the Church must not complain if "parties" take in hand what she herself appears unable to achieve. I am sure that in this matter of Test Schools we are at the heart of our difficulty.

(e) The foregoing considerations lead to another, which may appear controversial; I shall merely state it, with as little comment as possible. My observation of the whole field leads me to believe that a large proportion of the men who are now coming forward for Ordination belong to one or other of the more marked schools of thought in the Church of England; the Central Churchmen provide comparatively few. There are strange cross-divisions; some Fundamentalists appear equally among Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals, and a large number on both sides are definitely Liberals (? Modernists). But the men tend to range themselves, and not to be content simply with moderation. I record these facts

from my own observation; they need thinking about.

III. THE PROBLEM AS A WHOLE

There is urgent need in the Church of England for the co-ordination of the various groups which are responsible for the selection and training of candidates for the Ministry, and for much closer co-operation between them. At present there is almost none; or, at least, what there is is unacknowledged. The Central Advisory Council of Training for the Ministry appears to have no official cognizance of the fact that every year Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics are raising many thousands of pounds selecting and financing in whole or in part hundreds of men for the ministry of the Church of England. Even the Lambeth Conference Report hints only very vaguely (Resolution 62, page 59) at the real situation. Now if it were true that the great number of candidates were Central Churchmen, with a small fringe of Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals, this policy might perhaps be justifiable. But since, as I have already written, there is a very large number of definitely Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic candidates, it would surely be wise that the Church should officially take notice of the er the historica area from head. New York

Let me illustrate from my own experience. I am chairman of a committee which administers a sum of money amounting to from £12,000 to £15,000 annually, and interviews hundreds of men with a view to their Ordination. In actual fact, a very large number of the men who receive grants from the Anglo-Catholic Ordination Candidates Fund are also receiving help from the Sponsors' Scheme; and the same is true of the Evangelical Funds. But no kind of overt recognition of this fact is made by the official Church. I wonder how many Anglicans have the least idea of it?

And the dear old Church of England shakes her head, murmuring in an embarrassed manner, "Party Organization! Party Funds!" and goes on looking the other way. "Facts are such horrid things," as Mrs. Johnson wrote to Lady Susan Vernon more than a century ago. But such facts as I have quoted cannot safely be left unfaced. No doubt it would be best that the Church as a whole should be responsible for the selection, training, and if need be the financing of her candidates for Ordination. At the present moment the Church of England is not yet ready for this most desirable development. But it is comprehensive, and comprehension surely means that all the elements comprehended should be allowed to co-operate openly for the good of the whole. The Fifth Lambeth Committee says (p. 169): "We have expressed our opinion in a resolution . . . that it is the duty of the Church as a whole to make provision for them" (i.e., the candidates who need assistance). Exactly; but the time has not yet come when this hope can be fully realized. Should there not therefore be an interim policy, involving the fullest recognition and understanding between the centre and all the various bodies which are interested in Ordination candidates? Thus we should avoid a great deal of the overlapping, waste of energy (and of money), and even mutual suspicion which now exist, and not only hold back the work, but also injure the young men who are preparing for the priesthood of the Church. Such a policy would hasten the time when the Church as such would take on the entire responsibility. containing after them to the

IV. How ARE MEN TO BE FOUND?

Finally, how can more men be found for the Anglican Ministry? It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the two organizations chosen by the Lambeth Report for special mention. The Student Christian Movement does not belong specifically to the Church of England; it embraces young people of all and every form of Christianity, and provides opportunities for free and open discussion of modern religious problems. A great many young men find their way into the Anglican priesthood and into many other ministries as well, through the S.C.M., though the movement does not avow any intention of providing candidates for Ordination.

Toc H again is avowedly based on the Christian religion, and from it also come not a few vocations. If I were asked why these two rather widely differing organizations thus provide men for the priesthood, I should answer that it is chiefly because both somehow make religion in the right sense modern and attractive, and both are founded in adventure

and comradeship.

It is remarkable that the men who come to the Anglican priesthood from the S.C.M. and Toc H. tend, as I have pointed out in a more general way, to be either rather strong Anglo-Catholics or Liberal Evangelicals. The Sixth Lambeth Committee says of young people in general: "They are looking for guidance to those whose teaching offers definiteness, reality and sincerity" (p. 191). This point is a very notable one.

But no doubt the largest source from which men come to the priest-

hood is to be found in the parishes, and in the influence of faithful parish priests. The Lambeth Report lays great stress on the importance of the individual touch in drawing out priestly vocations. It is only by knowing well some priest or priests that they come to see how attractive a vocation the ministry of the Church can be. No other, as they realize by contact, offers such close and intimate friendship with persons of every age and social class, or such opportunities for spiritual and social service.

But if this influence is really to count, the young men must realize that the priesthood is an expert vocation. Very much might be written upon this vital point. I am not sure that Committee V. is right in desiring that a sufficient supply of young (I wonder why young) clergy should be set free from parochial work to meet and help young men (p. 168). I am sure that what most attracts the best kind of young man is the object lesson of a faithful priest at his pastoral work among his people. And I am also inclined to think that the priest had better not be too young. Such pastors are always looking for vocations among the young men with whom they are in close and continual contact.

And last of all, I would recall words I used on a Church Congress platform six years ago; I believe they are true still. If the Church would find the necessary money for testing and training her candidates, there would be no want of fine young men ready and willing to serve her in the priesthood.

Francis Underhill.

and drive lander an air delicer, reclamar redeated alogher a related bareaged barres of the

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

names a todocrocome namenth, call in provide house delegar enclassibles, named a figure recommend of the money and work and todocretical

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. January, 1930.

This number opens with obituary notices of Professor Peake and of Professor Tout, both in the past frequent contributors to the Bulletin. The occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Theological Faculty of the University of Manchester calls forth a very interesting lecture by Professor Burkitt on the achievements in theology which mark the last twenty-five years. He remarks that while, unfortunately, ordinary people tend nowadays to think less of the past-including Holy Scripture—the study of ancient documents has made great progress from the very fact that it is now mainly in the hands of those who value the past for its own sake. The general outlines of Old Testament criticism are now settled, though many subsidiary problems still await solution. The study of the New Testament during the period has been profoundly influenced by Schweitzer and the eschatological school. As regards the mystery religions and hellenistic infiltrations, Dr. Burkitt suggests that if any dividing-line is wanted, it should be placed not between Christ and St. Paul or between Apostolic and subapostolic times, but between the mentality of St. Paul and that of his gentile converts at Corinth and elsewhere. He touches also upon the topics of Church History, the science of Christian Worship and Comparative Religion.

Mr. W. A. Pantin describes in some detail and with many illustrations one of the Rylands Library manuscripts containing a most quaint collection of proverbs and riddles in Latin and English.

Dr. Mingana continues his "Woodbrooke Studies," giving us this time

the text and English translation of an "Apocalypse of Peter," in Garshuni (Arabic in Syriac characters). The earlier part of this text is not published here, since it is identical with the "Book of the Rolls" published in 1901 by Mrs. Gibson. Dr. Mingana considers that while the greater part of this text comes from, perhaps, the fourteenth century, some sections are ancient. One passage at least seems Nestorian, or even Gnostic in origin. The Apocalypse is in the form of a narrative of Peter to Clement of what he saw in a vision during which great secrets of the universe were laid bare before him. Peter's questions, however, show considerably more ingenuity than the answers which he is supposed to have received. Why did the Creator make angels and men, knowing that they were going to sin? But the answer is, "If I had to create people only after examining through my prescience their future actions, I would not have created anybody at all." There are many veiled references to Islam of considerable interest, words of the Koran are quoted in an opposite sense to that given it by the Moslems; a strange expression, "the son of the wolf," almost certainly refers to Mohammed, and so on.

There are many other articles in this number, all displaying the same high standard of scholarship.

W. R. V. BRADE.

edital sell even of failer base about near amoust in to face on ed

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. July, 1930.

The most interesting article in this number, which is as usual with this publication replete with good things, is Dr. Mingana's account of a manuscript of the Peshitta New Testament in his possession, of Nestorian origin. The document is actually late, bearing the date of September 23, 1749, but it is an exact copy of an older MS. which Dr. Mingana dates 750 or thereabouts. Before the Fourth Gospel there is found a statement: "The holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ (according to) the preaching of John the younger," and at the end of the Gospel there is the colophon: "Here ends the writing of the holy Gospel (according to) the preaching of John who spoke in Greek in Bithynia." This is in disagreement with the traditional "Ephesus" and John "the Elder." Again, at the end of the same MS. is an account of the lives of the Twelve Apostles and others, ascribed here to Eusebius of Cæsarea. This states that the Apostle John left Patmos for Ephesus, and was accompanied by, among others, a John to whom he granted priesthood and the right to succeed him as Bishop in Ephesus. The tombs of both Johns are in Ephesus, "and it is John the disciple who wrote the Revelations [sic]." Thus the "elder" John may have been the Apostle himself and the "younger" the one who succeeded in the See. Also the "Revelations" need not be the canonical Apocalypse since that book is not generally recognized by the Nestorians, and it may mean any scriptural revealed and inspired matter. Dr. Mingana concludes, in the light of this tradition, that (a) Papias' statement regarding the existence of a disciple John may be considered to be possibly correct; (b) Harnack's hypothesis concerning the composition of the Fourth Gospel by a disciple of the Apostle has for the first time received documentary support which we are not at liberty to discount; and (c) the tradition regarding the composition of the Fourth Gospel at Ephesus is now for the first time challenged by documentary evidence, and the possibility that the Gospel was composed in Bithynia has to be considered. We have here a genuine piece of ancient tradition.

Professor Conway contributes a very interesting lecture on Cicero's originality and his ideas of the ethics of government. Dr. Mingana also continues his edition of the Garshuni "Apocalypse of Peter," giving an instalment dealing with the signs that are to announce the end of the age, and describing the persecuting "Children of the Wolf" under which designation the followers of Islam appear to be meant. There is also a lurid description in veiled language of Mohammed himself, together with various obscure allusions to the misdeeds of many Moslem princes.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1929. Heft 3/4.

yd febrai Theeta wood aydd deidw to eserciae cwf griffedia'n won w

This double number contains matter of first-rate importance. Von Dobschütz discusses the different strata of the Fourth Gospel, which he characterizes as religious meditation based on history. It is not a development of the Synoptists in the direction of Gnostic speculation, but an attempt of a writer living in circles which minimized the historical to put the figure of Christ in a background of history. E. LOHMEYER continues his "Problems of Pauline Theology" with acute, almost too acute, arguments. His subject in this instalment is "works of the law," a peculiarly Pauline phrase, in which "of the law" is a genitive difficult of definition. "Works" are the service which man renders to God, by grace. L. Brun of Oslo has an exegetical study of 2 Cor. v. 1-10. The key to the passage is the recognition that the majority of Christians, so the Apostle understood, would be alive at the Parousia and would be then changed." Dom de Bruyne, O.S.B., shows that St. Jerome on occasion wrote fictitious letters not intended for any recipient. F. BÜCHSEL shows that the literary structure of the First Epistle of St. John is purely Jewish, resembling that of the Halacha. A technical Essay by H. WAITZ on the Pseudo-Clementines will appeal to specialists. K. MÜLLER, the Church historian, discusses the special features which characterized the development of the episcopate at Alexandria, with special reference to Origen's evidence. His conclusions are contrary to those of Dr. Gore. A very attractive Essay is contributed by E. Hirsch on the three accounts in Acts of St. Paul's Conversion. That of chap. ix. is the account as told in Damascus, that of xxvi. the Apostles' own account. These cannot be harmonized, and xxvi. must clearly be preferred. In between falls xxii. which is explained as St. Luke's conflation of the two versions. In view of recent discussions on the origin of Baptism, J. JEREMIAS' article on proselyte Baptism is timely. He uses 1 Cor. x. 1, 2 as evidence for it. W. Spiegelberg rejects Deissmann's well-known use of an inscription running round a beaker (εὐφραίνου ἐφ' ὁ πάρει, read as ἐφ' ὁ πάρει; εὐφραίνου, "why are you here? be joyful") to support the traditional translation of Matt. xxvi. 50. Rather the inscription means "be glad you are here." So in the Gospel passage τοῦτ' ἐστίν is to be supplied—"so that is why you are come." This explanation is supported by the Coptic versions-"friend, that, on account of which thou art come"-and the Peshitta—"for that, that thou art come." W. K. L. C.

social relations, but it and bean charitated as indiamental in common the below the social and the below that the speciment of which the short product of the speciment of the social that the province of the social three the normal section of the social three the normal section in the section of the social section of the section of the

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxi., Nos. 1 and 2.

Dr. Robert Eisler replies rather angrily to Professor Solomon Zeitlin's criticisms of his championing of the Slavonic Josephus (J.Q.R., xx., p. 1. See also *The Quest*, October, 1928). Dr. Eisler is concerned to defend and discuss the Hebrew Josippon, a late and curious compilation the value of

which is practically nil for historical purposes.

Professor Solomon Zeitlin contributes an appreciation of Dr. Henry Malter's Text of the Tractate Ta'anit, a valuable addition to Talmudic literature, issued by the Jewish Publication Society of America. D. S. Sassoon reviews Dr. Israel Abraham's Thesaurus of Mediæval Hebrew Poetry now appearing, two volumes of which have been already issued by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Professor Jacob Hoschauder concludes his useful survey of Biblical literature, and several short notes and reviews complete this interesting double number.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique.

In the July number Father Lebon offers some carefully considered restorations of the text of Theodoret of Cyr. He discusses two pseudoworks of his, the Περὶ τῆς ἀγίας and the Περὶ τῆς του κυριόμ ἐνανθρωσιήσεως. Inevitably he has much to say about the position of Severus of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria. This leads him on to deal with Εχθεσις της ορθης πίστεως. An article quite off the usual track is that of Father Brian-Chaninov, who analyzes the Russian theological writings of the Middle Ages. He begins with Luc Jidiata, who was archbishop of Novgorod in the eleventh century, and he comes down to the thirteenth century. In his last sentence he drily remarks that the true Russian Middle Ages scarcely begin till the fourteenth century and that they last to the end of the seventeenth. One is tempted to add that in view of the condition of the vast bulk of the peasantry the Middle Ages still exist so far as the labouring men are concerned. Father Dhanis examines some ancient sacramental formulas. Fathers De Poorter and Brys write elaborate notes on a manuscript of mediæval law found in the ancient Abbey of Bruges. They in effect examine no less than sixty-two volumes found in the library of Bruges. Lastly Father Salmon writes notes on the "Meditations" of St. Simon Bonhomme which he found in the Abbey of Clervaux. R. H. M.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. x., Nos. 2 and 3.

"The ethical point of view of liberal Christianity is the counterpart of its religious outlook; consequently, Jesus is made normative in ethics as well as in the Christian's spiritual life." "The method of ascertaining Jesus' normative ideal has varied in Christocentric presentations. The earliest mode was to relate the 'teachings of Jesus' in systematic form." "Numerous interpretations of 'Jesus' method of love' have been proposed. Not only has it been advanced as a singular method of adaptation in men's social relations, but it has been absolutized as fundamental in cosmic behaviour." Thus far, of which the above quotations are specimens, and the reviewer took a deep breath before proceeding farther. Then: "Back of all these efforts to locate the normative factor in Jesus for ethics

has been the assumption that Jesus disclosed, either in his teaching, his own individual character, or both, the absolute ethical ideal embodying the true response to the will of God." He gasped. What does "normative factor in Jesus for ethics" mean? And does an ethical ideal ever embody a response? It may stimulate, or—to borrow from this strange language—it may motivate, but we fail to see how it can embody. We fail, in fact, to see any sense at all. But, courage! "Christocentric theologians assume the ethical task to be that of ascertaining the revealed ideal, and of successfully applying it normatively in human living. Now, in contrast to this normative interpretation of the ethical task, the whole trend of modern ethics has been to interpret the ethical task experimentally with reference to moral needs arising out of the conditions of life within the natural world. This approach has focussed attention upon the moral requirements of human ends, growing out of the interplay of human relationships, rather than upon the requirements of supernatural ends. It has sought to create value for human living; not merely to reproduce an a priori perfect pattern. The effect of this approach has been to regard all ideals as relative and functional, rather than as absolute or normative. It has subjected all ideals to the experimental test: how do they contribute to the concrete end of human welfare for which the ideal is to function? Now when the Christocentric ideal is shorn of the a priori prestige that revelation gave it, and is put upon this experimental basis, several interesting questions arise." No doubt that is so for those who understand the language. The reviewer, however, lost consciousness at this point. His spirit, borne uneasily through realms of wordy fog, lighted for a moment on the following: "What we are saying here is that Christian idealism will have to be flexible enough in content to adapt creatively to whatever social experiment is being tried. In conclusion, we would add that carefully defining the church's function in social reconstruction certainly implies intelligently developing its methods of worship so as to render them productive of the kinds of attitudes and insights which will actually further social betterment." And then he woke up to find himself murmuring, "Tut, tut." H. S. MARSHALL.

Anglican Theological Review. Vol. xii., No. 5.

This number opens with an article by C. A. Manning on "Dostoyevsky and Western Christianity." Dostoyevsky admittedly knew the West but slightly at first hand. Yet his reaction to the West as he knew it is, up to a point, penetrating. He could pay a just tribute to the devotion of the priests of the Roman Church, and at the same time assert that "in proclaiming as a dogma 'that Christianity cannot maintain itself on the earth without the temporal sovereignty of the Pope,' it has proclaimed a new Christ, unlike the old, who has yielded to the third temptation of the devil, to earthly rule." Protestantism he saw as a mere negation, the self-assertion of the Teuton over against Latin Catholic civilization. Anglicanism appeared to him as "a religion of the rich and without a mask . . . Those professors of religion convinced to stupidity have only one kind of amusement, it is missionary work. They go out over the whole earth, they go into the depths of Africa, to convert a savage, and they forget the millions of savages in London because they have nothing to pay them." F. W. Buckler, in "The Meaning of the Cross," starts from the observation that "among the significant developments of

modern Liberal Protestantism none is more clearly marked than the tendency to belittle or ignore the importance of the Cross. . . . The real trouble appears to lie in the fact that the Church has never really evaluated the Cross in terms of the Kingdom of God." This F. W. Buckler attempts to do by asserting that "the political theory of Kingship which appears to underlie the whole of our Lord's teaching of the Kingdom of God seems to be derived from the Medo-Persian King—the Great King -through the medium of Alexander the Great and the Seleucids." The attempt to illuminate the problem of the Cross from this assumption, though interesting, hardly carries us far enough to solve the problem with which F. W. Buckler has started. C. Kaplan writes on "Angels in the Book of Enoch," and Clyde Murley gives a number of parallels between Plato and the New Testaments. One of the editors, Dr. F. C. Grant, deals with "Economic Messianism and the Teaching of Jesus." Starting from the assumption which he has already elaborated in two earlier articles on the "Economic Significance of Messianism" (A.T.R. vi. 3 and vii. 3) that Messianism originated in and was sustained by the collision between an ardent, intransigent faith in the absolute sovereignty of God and untoward economic conditions—intolerable conditions for this faith," Dr. Grant in this article attempts to answer the question "Why then did our Lord adopt Messianism as the vehicle of his message? This number concludes with fifty pages of reviews, valuable as always not only for the American reaction to English and European books, but even more for the American books reviewed. handon of sol bendalt and observed entired for a sounded

tovould wer visvitaers sende of method of during siderali at a local lite. Theologische Blätter. September.

Contract transferred by their that the resident research

This number contains articles on various religious communities. Professor R. Strothmann writes on the Coptic metropolitans of the Abyssinian Church in modern times, up to the election of John XIX., the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, in 1928. Professor Bess sketches the history of the church of Hessen-Kassel from 1821 to the present day. Professor K. L. Schmidt discusses Professor M. Rade's thesis on the evangelical theological faculty and the Evangelical Church. Lastly, Professor O. Piper describes the fifth conference of students at Hohensolm, and outlines a scheme for the instruction of adults in evangelical principles. L. Patterson.

us, up to a point, ponetrating. He could pay a just tribute to the devotion of the priests of the Reman Church's and at the same about that

Here's will taken to dense time in the transfer of the companies as a particular of the on the carts without the being several several of the Popel with procharged a new therest untike the old, who have peded to the she atted venture. tion of the death to extitute other." Typestantian by saw as a more

ological) until rachess us to nominal out to no no accomplished but the land again

withinguist on being recommission to mission of mission courses and a recommission have only one hand of amusencent, it is missionary work. There we one over the whole carrie, they go into the depths of airsen, to convere a savage, and they torget the mallions of eavingers in Louisian beautiful trees they jury and fine to pay them. " F. W. Buckley in "The Meaning of the Cross." march from the observation that " among the significant developments of

REVIEWS

NAME OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

enomana which is tarken

802

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE, 1789-1848. A Study in Revival. By C. S. Phillips, D.D. Mowbray and Co. 15s.

Dr. Phillips has drawn a masterly outline of the experience through which the Church of France passed in the first half of the nineteenth century. It was no easy thing to select, from a period crowded with historic characters and dramatic events, the crucial matter, and to show the drift of the main movement, and at the same time to produce a readable result. Yet this is what the author has achieved. The cruel hardships of the Church under Napoleon's tyranny and then the wonderful recovery are powerfully represented. There are everywhere proofs of reading deep and wide, but the book is nowhere burdened with references—a fact for which the ordinary reader will be grateful.

The author has a gift of balanced judgment on events and persons, which is admirable and generally convincing. His corrections of Sainte-Beuve's unfair insinuations on the sincerity of Chateaubriand's conversion are based on the recent work of the Abbé Bertin and are valuable. Very judicial also is the estimate of the influence of the Génie du Christianisme on the

reaction from eighteenth-century infidelity.

With regard to the well-known account in Consalvi's Memoirs of the substitution at the last moment of an entirely different document in place of the Concordat which he had agreed to sign, Dr. Phillips brings evidence to show that the Cardinal's version of the facts is not altogether accurate. Research in the Vatican Archives leads to the conclusion that the Memoirs are right in stating that a new draft was substituted at the last moment, but they are wrong in alleging that there was any deliberate sharp practice. The explanation was simple. "It appears that the notorious Talleyrand had intervened at the eleventh hour to thwart what he considered an extreme complaisance on his master's part." It would not, however, be surprising if a critic questioned whether even Talleyrand had the audacity to do this without Napoleon's being aware of it.

The chief interest of the book is in the closing chapters where the revival is sketched. One would select in particular the analysis of the character and fortunes of the Liberal Catholic Movement and of the distinguished group of leaders, Lacordaire, Montalembert and Lamennais. Dr. Phillips tells the story with

remarkable freshness.

The religious transition of Lamennais from the ardent advocacy of extreme Ultramontanism to the vagueness of a

meagre Deism is one of the strange phenomena which is far from easy to explain. It is treated in these pages with much insight and sympathy. Certainly it is a disconcerting fact that the author of the famous Essai sur l'indifférence dans les matières religieuses should also be the author of the later despairing and sceptical Paroles d'un Croyant. In his earlier period indifference to dogma was pronounced to be the sure precursor of atheism. All true religion was founded in authority. A Frenchman is usually either a Catholic or he is of no religion at all. But Lamennais' Catholicism was of the extreme Ultramontane. He could write in that stage of fervour such sentences as these: "Without the Pope no Church; without the Church no Christianity; without Christianity no religion for a people which was Christian, and therefore no social existence. Accordingly the hope of all European nations has its source, its only source, in the papal power." (Works, vii., p. 121; Dr. Phillips' numbering of the page is not quite exact.)

And yet Lamennais' career closed as Dr. Phillips says. "On February 27, 1854, in a shabby Paris lodging the tormented soul of the heresiarch found rest. He had refused to see a priest: and by his own injunction he was buried without religious rites of any kind" (p. 258). And this is a man who was at one time not far from being made a Cardinal. Leo XII., who appreciated his services to the papal cause, shrewdly measured the limitations of his temperament. He is "one of those lovers of perfection who, if they were allowed, would turn the world upside down." "He is a man whom it is necessary to lead with one's hand upon his heart" (p. 226). Dr. Phillips suggests that if Leo had been still Pope in 1831 when Lamennais' conflict with the French ecclesiastics estranged him altogether from the

Church there might have been a very different issue.

But Lamennais' ardent spirit could not endure the servitude to which the Church of France was reduced under the State. While the clergy of France as a body clung desperately to royalty for protection from democracy, Lamennais, who always held that Church and State should be inseparable so long as there was unity of belief, held that separation was imperative now that the functions of the State were discharged by men of any sort of belief or of no belief at all. Into this separation of Church and State Lamennais threw all his power. But it was, as Dr. Phillips points out, not unnatural that de Quelen, Archbishop of Paris, after witnessing the demolition of his splendid Palace by the mob, and the burning of its precious library, "found the invitation to make an alliance with the people frivolous rather than alluring."

Unfortunately for Lamennais Leo XII. was now replaced

by Gregory XVI. Dr. Phillips' description of the new Pope is vigorous. "The new Pope was an ecclesiastic of the narrowest type, whose name has become almost a byword for blind and stubborn reaction. A Camaldolese monk, and sixty-six years of age, he had a mind constitutionally averse from new ideas of every kind, without anything in his training or career to counteract this defect. Having had little experience of administration he was intensely distrustful both of himself and of others. Yet this timid and reactionary individual was no sooner on the pontifical throne than he was confronted with a situation which would have taxed a Hildebrand or a Julius II. For years the Carbonari and similar secret societies had been diligently fomenting disaffection towards the inefficient and oppressive government of the Popes: and now under the stimulus provided by the successful revolutions of the preceding years in other countries, the whole of the papal dominions burst into revolt. Gregory, at his wits' end, turned for help to Austria, which was only too anxious to oblige him. The insurrection was quickly stamped out. But it had given the Pope's nerves a bad shaking, and made him less disposed than ever to make terms with those liberal principles which he (quite rightly) regarded as incompatible with the governmental system he was pledged to uphold " (p. 244).

This very clear and masterly exposition reduces the romantic expedition of the "pilgrims of grace and liberty" to futility.

But the condemnation pronounced against them by Gregory XVI. in his Encyclical Mirari vos, a condemnation which the faith of Montalembert and Lacordaire survived, was more than Lamennais' faith in the Church could endure. Dr. Phillips thinks that Lamennais' Ultramontanism had always been rather political than religious. But his entire belief in Christianity seemed based on Ultramontanism. This utter loss of faith in Christ raises problems which go far beyond the sphere of the historian. But they are problems which the interests of religion compel us to reconsider.

Enough has been said to show that this is an exceptionally

able piece of historical study.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

Hebrew Religion. Its Origin and Development. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and Theodore H. Robinson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

A book of this kind is most welcome; not that A. B. Davidson (1904), Kautzsch (1904), H. P. Smith (1914), are by any means out of date; but we need periodically a fresh survey of

Israel's religious history to keep pace with the advance of Biblical studies. Both the authors have written much on the Old Testament, and are well abreast of recent literature; as experienced teachers, too, they know how to give the gist of a

subject or a document in an effective way.

The problem of method, which has to be faced at the outset, they have settled by a compromise. Everyone now admits that the religion of Israel cannot be investigated apart from the history; but a difficulty arises at once: while the history falls into well-defined periods, the religion to a great extent is independent of them. We may follow the sequence of the periods, and study the religious features which predominated in each; this was Kautzsch's method in his masterly treatise (Hastings' Dict. of the Bible, vol. v.). On the other hand, A. B. Davidson adopts a purely theological treatment, not altogether satisfactory from the historical point of view, but from the religious, most valuable; he is possessed by the great ideas; he knows what religion means. Our authors have combined both plans. The main part of the book traces the development of religion down to the Greek Period; then follow five chapters which deal comprehensively with subjects of special importance. There is much to be said for this method; if it involves going over some of the ground again, that is rather an advantage than otherwise; but it leaves us with a sense of loose ends and no clear view of the goal; we miss the climax, though it is indicated on p. 341, in the chapter on Wisdom.

Israel's religion sprang out of the common stock of Semitic beliefs and customs. We must begin with these, of course. The account of them takes up about a third of the present book, and makes excellent reading, though some of the details hardly rise above the footnote level, and one is inclined to grudge the space devoted to the Background. Speaking generally of the work as a whole, we can warmly commend it; and such criticisms as we have to make are chiefly concerned with matters of

compol as to reconsider.

emphasis and balance of treatment.

Our authors are surely right in recognizing a "double standard in Israel" as the key to the history of the middle and later monarchy (p. 183). There were the nomad or pastoral groups, who retained much of the simplicity of the wilderness period; and there was the agricultural and urban population, whose religion tended to be merged in that of the Canaanites. Some such distinction must be admitted; but how are we to account for the nomad element? It is incredible that the Hebrew tribes who were freed from slavery in Egypt should have developed the habits and beliefs of a nomad race in the course of the traditional "forty years." The problem is too

often slurred over. Our authors make two suggestions which are well worth considering: (1) that the nomadic standard was inherited not so much from the tribes of the Exodus period, as from the Aramæan ancestors who entered Canaan long before; and (2) that it was the tribes on the east of Jordan and in the south of Palestine, the regions from which Elijah and Amos came, who clung to the primitive worship of Jahveh, and stood

out against prevailing tendencies.

How did this knowledge of Jahveh arise? Tradition held that God revealed Himself to Moses; that is to say, Moses obtained a new truth about God; and since he did not learn it from his predecessors, or by any reflection of his own, he must have learned it from God Himself. The fact of a revelation is fundamental in the Old Testament; and along with it goes, on the human side, the correlative fact of inspiration. God spoke, and a few chosen men were inspired to put on record what they heard. This central fact is not made prominent in the book before us; and the nature of prophetic inspiration is passed over, although modern psychology has thrown a good deal of light upon it.

The treatment of the prophets strikes as rather perfunctory. Something more than brief summaries of the prophetic writings might be looked for in a history of religion. For example, if only to illustrate the heights that were attained, what can surpass the situation in 701 B.C., when Sennacherib laid siege to Jerusalem? It was one of the darkest hours in Israel's history, and one of the brightest in the records of religion. No doubt Isaiah taught a profoundly moral conception of Jahveh's holiness (p. 208); but he also taught, and single-handed he

maintained, the obligation of loyalty to the faith.

As we learn to understand prophecy better, we are naturally led to revise and improve our ideas on the whole subject of the "Messianic" hope. The conventional use of the term begs the question; it is better to speak of the prophetic ideals, or of the divine purpose for Israel. If the word "Messianic" is used at all, let it be applied only to those passages in which the ideal king is present, or the nation is ideally personified. At the same time, it is increasingly clear that, in a deeper sense than convention imagines, the finest elements in Hebrew religion prepared the way for those larger conditions under which alone they reach their goal. Another term which produces much confusion is "eschatology." Properly it is applicable only to the last things; and the Old Testament says little about the end of the world or the final judgment. The Day of the Lord is, indeed, often mentioned; but has it anything to do with "eschatology" in the proper meaning of the term? On p. 256 twelve

passages are quoted from Ezekiel as describing "the terrors of that day." In only one of them does the word day occur, and then as part of the phrase "in the cloudy and dark day" (xxxiv. 12); and it may be questioned whether the prophet is thinking about the final catastrophe at all. Is he not rather proclaiming acts of punishment which are not to end the world, but to better the world, and make Israel more worthy of a place in it?

One further point may be mentioned because it concerns the two most characteristic institutions of Hebrew religion, Prophecy and Law; the relation between them raises an issue as much alive today as it was in the time of Amos. "To the ordinary Israelite sin was a neglect of ritual regulations; to the prophets it was a violation of the moral law" (p. 202). That is admirably said, and perfectly true. But the same paragraph closes with the remark, "The God of Israel, alone among the deities worshipped by men, made no ritual demands; to Him sacrifice was a weariness, and, when substituted for morality, an abomination (cp. Isa. i. 11-15)." That, we believe, is an over-statement. The prophets fling down the moral challenge without compromise or qualification; but it is a mistake to interpret their language as demanding the abolition of all outward observances of religion. What we notice, as time goes on, is the gradual fusion of Law and Prophecy; we see it in Deuteronomy, in Ezekiel, in the post-exilic prophets; while the Priestly Code itself, the very embodiment of legalism, aims at enforcing in practice the truly prophetic conception of an all-holy God who requires holiness of His people. Prophecy lasted on, kindling hope and vision, by the written word if no longer by the living voice; and Law furnished a background of disciplined religious life. The combination of the two was vital to religion, if Law was to be saved from formalism, and Prophecy from the empty fate of dreams.

It is surprising that our authors have not made more use of the Psalms and Daniel in their chapters on worship and the apocalyptic literature. Under the Problem of Suffering we wish to call attention to the skilful treatment of the Book of Job; nothing could be better than the way in which the argument is traced up to the final message, and the by-products of the discussion allowed their proper value. The notes on Persian influences upon the later theology seem to have been hastily put together; at any rate, they do not make out an entirely convincing case. A few minor matters need correction. There are some unfortunate printer's errors on pp. 83, 84; some wrong transliterations of Hebrew forms on pp. 32 (two) and 106 (four)—in fact, the system requires overhauling—e.g., pp. 57, 70; wrong references occur on pp. 25, 336 (? Ezek. xvi. 44 for xvii. 2). The footnote on p. 124 might be reconsidered: Asherah is now

known to have been the name of a goddess; philologically it is quite distinct from Astarte. Scholars ought not to speak of "authenticity" when they mean traditional authorship (p. 255 n.). These small points can be put right in another edition, which is bound to come, for the book deserves to be widely used.

G. A. COOKE.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF REALITY. By W. Lutoslawski. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

This book is always interesting, sometimes suggestive, often provocative, rarely convincing. The description of Polish Messianism, a theory of Nationality which has noble aspects, is preceded by a dozen chapters providing the philosophical foundation. It is not necessary to accept this peculiar philosophy in order to embrace the belief in the "Nation-Saviour" (p. 145) or the "Nation-Christ" (p. 153). Most readers, however, will probably reject both. The Philosophy, which closely resembles modern Theosophy, traces the existence of matter to the Fall (p. 75), and includes as matter, "unuttered words or victorious temptations" (p. 95). The reality of matter is discovered to be derivative and to depend upon opposition to spirit (pp. 92 and 96), its true character, which is partially known by mysticism (p. 127), being fully understood only by Messianism (p. 144). Apart from the crudity of the belief in relics (p. 72), and the undisguisedly magical conception of transubstantiation (p. 76), the "philosophical alternatives" will probably fail to commend themselves because they rest upon an arbitrary classification of the mentality of the thinkers (p. 5). Indeed, the discredited "faculty psychology" seems to be implied, especially when a new faculty is invented to fit the scheme (p. 140). Throughout the book dogmatic assertions are frequent, and these are not infrequently questionable (e.g., on pp. 61, 76, 80, 111, 165). But since the author roundly condemns those who will not "accept blindly" what is to them unintelligible (p. 102), the pontifical style is inevitable. Polish Messianism, to which all this leads up, is defined as "the immortality of true nations, each such nation being formed by certain spirits who reincarnate many times in the same national territory designed by Providence for that purpose" (p. 150). Reincarnation, required for the theory, is read into several texts of the New Testament by an ingenious but inadmissible exegesis (e.g., John iii. 5: "Water in the sense of matter as Thales taught," p. 168). In the Millennium which will follow upon the realization of Messianism, one task to be undertaken will be "the control of the climate" (p. 180). CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

NOTICE

MORAL SENSE. By James Bonar, LL.D. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

The conception of a moral sense dominates an important period in the development of ethical theory. It is tempting to speak of the Moralists in question as the Scottish School. Although Shaftesbury, who first invoked a moral sense, was not a Scot, Kant, who finally abolished the fiction, was the grandson of a Scotsman, while Hutcheson, Hume and Adam Smith, the great men of the School, and also Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart, were all born north of the Tweed. What has been said for and against a moral sense by the Ethicists of this period is clearly expounded in this book. Dr. Bonar points out that "if the theory of a Moral Sense had not fallen to pieces of itself, it would have shared the downfall of the multitudinous faculties of the old psychology" (p. 250). But it does not follow by any means that because the idea of a moral sense is obsolete, the theories which have to reckon with that idea have nothing to offer to modern thought. The present time calls insistently for a reconstruction of moral theory, and Dr. Bonar's careful and critical study of this Scottish School of Moralists is a valuable and timely contribution. The conditions of thought two centuries ago resemble in many ways the conditions of thought in our own day. The failure of these Moralists to get beyond "respectability" or "propriety" and their inability to explain moral obligation ("right and wrong, ought and ought not are not explained" p. 171), are consequences inevitable upon the reduction of morality to convention. Not only, as Hume thought, is the "sense of Justice derived from an artifice" (p. 128), the other virtues too, supposed to be secured by the moral sense, are unsupported by any objective authority. The device of the "spectator" is inadequate: "We should, perhaps, find in the spectator only an awkward expression for selfconsciousness" (p. 180). Sympathy cannot meet the need: "Sympathy is a mirror and does not give us something new; it gives us only ourselves " (p. 232). Kant finds the needed objectivity in reason, where Hume also would have found it ("If morality were determined by reason," p. 102), but for his strange psychology which made "reason the slave of the passions" (p. 88). The need for some ultimate reference is vaguely guessed by Hutcheson and Smith, who both assume that God is somehow behind moral authority. But there is no suggestion that morality is conformity to the nature of reality or to the revealed will of God.

Much that is said about moral sense can be applied equally to our notion of conscience. "It is not instinctive but acquired" (p. 250), and moreover, "acquired through the moral training given by social institutions, family, society, and the state" (p. 258). Nevertheless, "we must use the power bred in us by society to alter that society itself" (p. 259). It is in this way that moral progress is attained. One problem of moral advance, however acute for these moralists, still awaits solution—the problem of adjusting the claims of self-realization and self-abnegation. Dr. Bonar's book, it will be seen, is much more than a study in

the history of Ethics, and it is excellent in every respect.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.